

SYMMETRIC POWERS AND A PROBLEM OF KOLLÁR AND LARSEN

ROBERT M. GURALNICK AND PHAM HUU TIEP

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $\mathbb{F}$ be an algebraically closed field of characteristic $\ell \geq 0$, $V = \mathbb{F}^d$, and let $\mathcal{G} = GL(V)$, or $GO(V)$, resp. $Sp(V)$ (the full isometry group of a non-degenerate symmetric, resp. alternating, bilinear form on V). In various applications, including in the classification of maximal subgroups of classical groups and in algebraic geometry, it is important to know which closed subgroups G of $\mathcal{G}$ can act irreducibly on $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ for some $k \geq 2$. The list of such subgroups G , under the assumption that G is connected and positive dimensional, has been determined by Dynkin [Dyn] in characteristic 0 and by Seitz [Se1] and Testerman [Tes] in positive characteristic. A conjecture of Kollár and Larsen [KL] asserts that if k is not too small, say $k \geq 4$, the complete list of such subgroups G remains essentially the same when G is assumed to be closed. This conjecture has interesting implications, in particular on the holonomy group of a stable vector bundle on a smooth projective variety, cf. the very recent work of Balaji and Kollár [BK]. The main result of the paper proves this conjecture in the affirmative.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\mathbb{F}$ be an algebraically closed field of characteristic $\ell \geq 0$ and $V = \mathbb{F}^d$ with $d > 4$. Assume that a Zariski closed subgroup G of $\mathcal{G} := GL(V)$ acts irreducibly on $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ for some $k \geq 4$. Then either $\ell = 0$ or $\ell > k$. Moreover, one of the following holds.*

- (i) $\mathcal{H} \triangleleft G \leq N_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{H})$ with $\mathcal{H} \in \{SL(V), Sp(V)\}$.
- (ii) $\ell > 0$, $L \triangleleft G \leq N_{\mathcal{G}}(L)$, where L is a quotient of $SL_d(q)$, $SU_d(q)$, or $Sp_d(q)$ for some power $q = \ell^a$.

Part of this paper was written while the authors were participating in the Workshop on Lie Groups, Representations and Discrete Mathematics at the Institute for Advanced Study (Princeton). It is a pleasure to thank the Institute for its generous hospitality and support.

The authors would like to thank János Kollár for suggesting this problem to them and for insightful comments on the paper, Nolan Wallach for discussions about the decompositions for various tensor powers of the natural module for classical groups, Jürgen Müller for proving some results about modular representations of ${}^2E_6(2)$, and Thomas Breuer, Gunter Malle, Frank Lübeck, and Alexandre Turull for their help with various computer calculations.

The authors gratefully acknowledge the support of the NSF (grants DMS-0653873 and DMS-0600967), and of the NSA (grant H98230-04-0066).

(iii) $k = 4, 5$. Furthermore, $L \triangleleft G \leq N_G(L)$ with $(d, L) = (6, 2J_2), (12, 2G_2(4)), (12, 6Suz)$.

(iv) $k = 4, 5$, $\ell = 5, 7$, $8900000 > d \geq 196882$, and $M \triangleleft G \leq N_G(M)$, where M is the Monster sporadic finite simple group.

Conversely, the cases listed in (i) – (iii) give rise to examples.

Observe that there are infinite series of examples of finite subgroups of $GL(V)$, not satisfying conclusions (ii)–(iv) of Theorem 1.1 and such that $\text{Sym}^2(V)$ and $\text{Sym}^3(V)$ are irreducible over G , cf. [MT2]. Another curious example is that the subgroup $G_2(\mathbb{C})$ of $\mathcal{G} = SO_7(\mathbb{C})$ is irreducible on all $\mathcal{G}$ -composition factors of $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ for all k , cf. [Sel].

The small dimensional case is handled by the following:

Theorem 1.2. *Let $\mathbb{F}$ be an algebraically closed field of characteristic $\ell \geq 0$ and $V = \mathbb{F}^d$ with $d \leq 4$. Assume that a Zariski closed subgroup G of $\mathcal{G} := GL(V)$ acts irreducibly on $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ for some $k \geq 4$. Then either $\ell = 0$ or $\ell > k$ or $d \leq 2$. Furthermore, one of the following holds.*

- (i) $\mathcal{H} \triangleleft G \leq N_G(\mathcal{H})$ with $\mathcal{H} \in \{SL(V), Sp(V)\}$.
- (ii) $\ell > 0$, $L \triangleleft G \leq N_G(L)$, where L is a quotient of $SL_d(q)$, $SU_d(q)$, or $Sp_d(q)$ for some power $q = \ell^a$.
- (iii) $\ell \neq 2$, $d = 2$, $G = Z(G) * SL_2(5)$. Furthermore, $k = 4, 5$ if $\ell = 0$ or $\ell > 5$, $k = 4$ if $\ell = 5$, and $k = 5$ if $\ell = 3$.
- (iv) $\ell = 5$, $d = 3$, $G = Z(G) * 3A_7$, and $k = 4$.

Conversely, all the above cases give rise to examples.

As shown in [BK], Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 imply

Corollary 1.3. [BK, Cor. 6] *Let E be a stable vector bundle on a complex smooth projective variety X of rank different from 2, 6, 12. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) $\text{Sym}^k(E)$ is stable for some $k \geq 4$.
- (ii) $\text{Sym}^k(E)$ is stable for every $k \geq 4$.
- (iii) The commutator subgroup of the holonomy group is either $SL(E_x)$ or $Sp(E_x)$.

□

The exceptions in rank 2, 6, and 12 are related to the possibilities described in Theorem 1.1(iii) and Theorem 1.2(iii).

The main ideas of our proofs can be outlined as follows. Suppose a subgroup G of $GL(V)$ satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem 1.1, resp. Theorem 1.2. First, arguments along the lines of Aschbacher's Theorem [A] reduce the problem to the cases where G normalizes either a certain p -group for a prime p dividing d , a simple algebraic group, or a finite (quasi)simple group S , cf. Proposition 2.14. The first case can be handled quickly using character-theoretic methods, see Theorem 5.1. In the second case, as well as in the third case with S a finite group of Lie type defined in the

same characteristic ℓ as of $\mathbb{F}$, various tools from the (modular) representation theory of algebraic groups (cf. Theorem 3.1) allow us to reduce to the case of connected reductive algebraic groups and then apply the classic results of Dynkin [Dyn] and Seitz [Se1]. The main obstacles arise in the third case and moreover when S is not a finite group of Lie type in the same characteristic as of $\mathbb{F}$. Unlike the situations considered previously in [GT2] and [MMT], the irreducibility of $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ does not yield (nontrivial) upper bounds on $\dim(V)$ – such a bound was the crucial step in the mentioned papers. The key idea here is to show that G possesses a large enough subgroup C such that the restriction of $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ to C contains a small enough submodule. Even though this argument does not yield an upper bound on $\dim(V)$, it does lead to a strong constraint on G and some of its natural subgroups which ultimately yields a contradiction, cf. for instance Proposition 4.2. The case when S is a sporadic finite simple group also presents considerable difficulties since for some of them (say the Monster) there is only very scarce information about their modular representation theory (and this is usually available only when the Sylow ℓ -subgroups of S are cyclic). As usual, low dimensional representations such as Weil representations of finite classical groups and basic spin representations of (double covers of) symmetric and alternating groups also require special treatment as well. In certain situations when ℓ is large enough, results of Serre [S] and McNinch [McN] allow one to reduce to the complex case.

In this paper we also obtain various results concerning the reducibility of exterior powers $\wedge^k(V)$ as well. But, as the example of S_n acting on the heart of the natural permutation module shows, the irreducibility of $\wedge^k(V)$ is not enough to tell apart $\mathcal{G}$ from its finite closed subgroups, cf. also [MMT]. In fact, as shown in Proposition 2.21 and Theorem 5.1, a Zariski closed subgroup of $GL(V)$ with $\dim(V) \geq 6$ can be irreducible on $\wedge^k(V)$ for some $k \geq 3$ only when either G is almost quasi-simple (i.e. $\text{soc}(G/Z(G))$ is a simple, algebraic or finite, group) or G stabilizes a decomposition of V into 1-spaces. We intend to fully investigate this question in a sequel of the paper. Here we will prove the following theorem

Theorem 1.4. *Let $\mathbb{F}$ be an algebraically closed field of characteristic 0, $V = \mathbb{F}^d$ with $d > 4$, and let G be a Zariski closed subgroup of $GO(V)$. Assume G does not contain $SO(V)$. Then G is either reducible on $\text{Sym}^4(V)/\text{Sym}^2(V)$, or on $\wedge^4(V)$ for $d > 7$, or on $\wedge^2(V)$ for $d \leq 7$.*

(In the situation of this theorem, one can identify $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ with the space of homogeneous polynomials of degree k in d variables. The $GO(V)$ -invariant quadratic form on V yields a $GO(V)$ -invariant quadratic polynomial Q , and the multiplication by Q yields an embedding of $\text{Sym}^2(V)$ into $\text{Sym}^4(V)$.)

Theorem 1.4 in particular yields another proof of Larsen’s conjecture proved in [GT2]. (Indeed, the proof in [GT2] uses the irreducibility of G on every $GO(V)$ -composition factor of $V^{\otimes 4}$ to derive the containment $G \geq SO(V)$, whereas the new

proof, see Corollary 1.5 and its proof below, uses G -irreducibility only on a few specific composition factors.) Larsen's conjecture has already been used by Katz, to study the monodromy group attached to a Lefschetz pencil of smooth hypersurface sections of a projective smooth variety X over a finite field k [Ka1], and to determine the geometric monodromy group attached to a family of character sums over finite fields [Ka2]. It also has implications on the holonomy group of a stable vector bundle on a complex smooth projective variety, cf. [BK].

Corollary 1.5. (Larsen's conjecture) *Let $\mathbb{F}$ be an algebraically closed field of characteristic 0, $V = \mathbb{F}^d$ and let $\mathcal{G} = GL(V)$, $GO(V)$, or $Sp(V)$. If $d \leq 4$, assume in addition that $\mathcal{G} \neq GO(V)$. Let G be a Zariski closed subgroup of $\mathcal{G}$ such that G° is reductive and G does not contain $[\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{G}]$. Then one of the following holds.*

- (i) $\dim(\text{End}_G(V^{\otimes 4})) > \dim(\text{End}_{\mathcal{G}}(V^{\otimes 4}))$.
- (ii) $d = 6$, $\mathcal{G} = Sp(V)$, and $G = 2J_2$.
- (iii) $d = 2$, $\mathcal{G} = GL(V)$, and $G = Z(G) * SL_2(5)$.

Notice that we do not consider orthogonal groups in dimensions ≤ 4 in Theorem 1.4 and Corollary 1.5 because $SO_d(\mathbb{F})$ is not simple when $d = 1, 2, 4$ and isomorphic to $PSL_2(\mathbb{F})$ when $d = 3$. We also obtain the following variant of Corollary 2.19(i) which holds in almost every characteristic:

Corollary 1.6. *Let G be a closed subgroup of $GL(V)$, with $V = \mathbb{F}^d$ and $d \geq 3$ if $\text{char}(\mathbb{F}) > 0$. Assume that the G -module $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ is irreducible for some $k \geq 4$. If $k \leq 5$ and $M \triangleleft G \leq N_{GL(V)}(M)$, M being the Monster, assume furthermore that either $\text{char}(\mathbb{F}) \neq 5, 7$ or $\dim(V) \geq 8900000$. Then for every m , $1 \leq m \leq k$, the G -module $\text{Sym}^m(V)$ is also irreducible.*

Corollary 1.6 cannot hold for $d = 2$ when $\text{char}(\mathbb{F}) > 0$, cf. Remark 2.2 below.

Throughout the paper, we use the convention that $\ell > N$ means that either $\ell = 0$ or $\ell > N$. The notation for simple groups is as in [Atlas]; in particular, M is the Monster, $6Suz$ is the sixth cover of the Suzuki group, and $2J_2$ is the double cover of the second Janko group. S_n , resp. A_n is the symmetric, resp. alternating, group on n symbols. $G * H$ denotes a central product of finite groups G and H , and $G^{(\infty)}$ is the last term of the derived series of G . We will assume that $\ell > k$ whenever we address the irreducibility of $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ with $\dim(V) \geq 3$, cf. Lemma 2.1(i). If G is a closed subgroup of $GL(V)$ then G° denotes the connected component of G , and the irreducible G -module with highest weight ϖ is denoted by $L(\varpi)$. If G is a finite group and χ a class function of G then $\hat{\chi}$ denotes the restriction of χ to ℓ' -elements in G ; furthermore, $\text{IBr}_\ell(G)$ denotes the set of all irreducible ℓ -modular Brauer characters of G . A G -module (over field of characteristic $\neq 2$) is said to be of type $+$, resp. $-$, if it supports a nondegenerate G -invariant symmetric, resp. alternating form; the same for (irreducible) ordinary or Brauer characters of G . If $N \triangleleft G$, then a simple N -module V is G -invariant if $V^g \simeq V$ for all $g \in G$. If G is any

finite group, then $\mathbf{m}(G)$ denotes the largest degree of complex irreducible characters of G ; clearly, $\mathbf{m}(G) \leq \sqrt{|G/Z(G)|}$. If G is a finite group of Lie type in characteristic p , then $\mathfrak{d}(G)$ denotes the smallest degree of nontrivial projective representations of G in characteristic other than p . We will freely use the Landazuri-Seitz-Zaleskii lower bounds on $\mathfrak{d}(G)$ and their latest improvements as recorded in [T2], and the upper bound for $\mathbf{m}(G)$ as given in [Se2].

2. PRELIMINARIES

Recall that $\mathbb{F}$ is an algebraically closed field of characteristic $\ell \geq 0$. Let $V = \mathbb{F}^d$ and let $\mathcal{G} = GL(V)$, $Sp(V)$, or $GO(V)$ throughout this section. We consider V as the irreducible $\mathcal{G}$ -module with highest weight ϖ_1 .

2.1. Basic reductions. To get some basic reductions for our problem, one might apply the fundamental result of Aschbacher [A]. But in our case one can give a direct argument (which in fact goes along the lines of the proof of Aschbacher's Theorem, and which also gives us some further information that will be needed later). The first step is to reduce to the case where the subgroup $G \leq GL(V)$ satisfies the following hypothesis:

- (S) : The G -module V is irreducible, primitive,
tensor indecomposable, and not tensor induced.

(Recall that the G -representation Φ of G on V is *tensor induced*, if there is a decomposition $V = V_1 \otimes \dots \otimes V_m$ into $m > 1$ vector spaces V_i of equal dimension, such that $\Phi(G) \leq (\otimes_{i=1}^m GL(V_i)) \cdot S_m$, with S_m naturally permuting the spaces V_i .)

Lemma 2.1. *Assume $G \leq GL(V)$, $\dim(V) \geq 2$, and $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ is irreducible over G for some $k \geq 2$.*

- (i) *If $\dim(V) \geq 3$ then $\text{char}(\mathbb{F}) > k$.*
- (ii) *G satisfies the hypothesis (S).*

Proof. (i) Assume that $d := \dim(V) \geq 3$ but $0 < \ell = \text{char}(\mathbb{F}) \leq k$. We will show that $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ is reducible over $SL(V)$. Let $0 \leq a \leq \ell - 1$ and $b, i > 0$ be any integers. Then notice that $(a + b\ell + i)/i \geq (a + i)(b + i)/i^2$ and in fact the inequality is strict if $i \geq 2$. Taking $i = 1, \dots, d - 1$, we see that

$$(1) \quad \dim(\text{Sym}^{a+b\ell}(V)) > \dim(\text{Sym}^a(V)) \cdot \dim(\text{Sym}^b(V)).$$

Write $k = a_0 + a_1\ell + \dots + a_s\ell^s$ for some integers $0 \leq a_0, \dots, a_s \leq \ell - 1$ and $a_s > 0$. Using induction on $s \geq 1$ with (1) as induction base, one can show that

$$(2) \quad \dim(\text{Sym}^k(V)) > \dim(\text{Sym}^{a_0}(V)) \cdot \dim(\text{Sym}^{a_1}(V)) \cdot \dots \cdot \dim(\text{Sym}^{a_s}(V)).$$

Now if the $SL(V)$ -module V has highest weight ϖ_1 , then $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ has highest weight $k\varpi_1$, whence it has a quotient isomorphic to $\text{Sym}^{a_0}(V) \otimes (\text{Sym}^{a_1}(V))^{(\ell)} \otimes$

$\dots \otimes (\text{Sym}^{a_s}(V))^{(\ell^s)}$ by Steinberg's tensor product theorem. Hence (2) implies that $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ is reducible.

(ii) Assume that G is reducible on V and $A \neq 0$ is a proper G -submodule of V . Then $\text{Sym}^k(A) \neq 0$ is a proper G -submodule of $\text{Sym}^k(V)$, a contradiction. Next assume that G is imprimitive on V . Then $V = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n V_i$ with G permuting the subspaces V_i 's transitively. It follows that $\bigoplus_{i=1}^n \text{Sym}^k(V_i)$ is a proper G -submodule of $\text{Sym}^k(V)$, a contradiction.

Now assume that the G -module V is tensor decomposable. Then $V = A \otimes B$ as a G -module, with $\dim A, \dim B > 1$. In particular $d \geq 4$ and so in view of (i) we may assume that $\ell > k$. Under this assumption on ℓ , $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ is just the fixed point subspace for S_k with S_k naturally permuting the k factors of $V^{\otimes k}$. Since $\text{Sym}^k(A) \otimes \text{Sym}^k(B)$ is fixed by S_k pointwise, it is a proper G -submodule of $\text{Sym}^k(V)$, again a contradiction.

Finally, assume that the G -module V is tensor induced. In this case, $V = \bigotimes_{i=1}^n V_i$ with G permuting the subspaces V_i transitively. Again $d \geq 4$ and so we may assume $\ell > k$. Hence, $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ contains the proper G -submodule $\bigotimes_{i=1}^n \text{Sym}^k(V_i)$, a contradiction. $\square$

Remark 2.2. Notice that Lemma 2.1(i) and Corollary 1.6 fail if $\dim(V) \leq 2$. In fact, if $\dim(V) = 2$ then for any integers $j \geq 1$ and $1 \leq b < \ell = \text{char}(\mathbb{F})$,

$$\text{Sym}^{(b+1)\ell^j-1}(V) = \text{Sym}^{\ell-1}(V) \otimes \text{Sym}^{\ell-1}(V)^{(\ell)} \otimes \dots \otimes \text{Sym}^{\ell-1}(V)^{(\ell^{j-1})} \otimes \text{Sym}^b(V)^{(\ell^j)}$$

is irreducible over $SL(V)$ (as well as over any $SL_2(\ell^n)$ with $n > j$). In particular, $\text{Sym}^{\ell^j}(V)$ is reducible but $\text{Sym}^{2\ell^j-1}(V)$ is irreducible over $SL(V)$. Another example is $G = SL_2(5)$ in $SL(V)$ with $\ell = 3$ and $d = 2$: here $\text{Sym}^5(V)$ is irreducible but $\text{Sym}^4(V)$ is reducible.

Remark 2.3. (i) Notice that $\text{Sym}^k(V^*) \simeq (\text{Sym}^k(V))^*$ if $\text{char}(\mathbb{F}) > k$ and $\wedge^k(V^*) \simeq (\wedge^k(V))^*$ if $1 \leq k \leq \dim(V) - 1$, as modules over $GL(V)$. Indeed, all these modules are irreducible over $SL(V)$, and we can see the isomorphism by comparing their highest weights.

(ii) Assume V and W are $\mathbb{F}G$ -spaces and $\text{char}(\mathbb{F}) > k$. Then

$$\text{Sym}^k(V \oplus W) \simeq \bigoplus_{i+j=k} \text{Sym}^i(V) \otimes \text{Sym}^j(W), \quad \wedge^k(V \oplus W) \simeq \bigoplus_{i+j=k} \wedge^i(V) \otimes \wedge^j(W),$$

and

$$\text{Sym}^k(V \oplus W) \simeq \bigoplus (\text{S}_\lambda V \otimes \text{S}_\lambda W), \quad \wedge^k(V \oplus W) \simeq \bigoplus (\text{S}_\lambda V \otimes \text{S}_{\lambda'} W),$$

where the first sum runs over all partitions λ of k with at most $\dim(V)$ or $\dim(W)$ rows, and the second sum runs over all partitions λ of k with at most $\dim(V)$ rows and at most $\dim(W)$ columns, cf. [FH, p. 80]. Here λ' is the partition conjugate to

λ and S_λ is the Schur functor corresponding to the partition λ . Indeed, the proof of these formulas in [FH, p. 521] uses only the semisimplicity of the group algebra $\mathbb{F}S_k$.

Lemma 2.4. *Assume $d \geq 3$, $\text{char}(\mathbb{F}) > 3$, $G \leq GL(V)$ and $\wedge^2(V)$ is irreducible over G . Then one of the following holds.*

- (i) *G satisfies the hypothesis (S).*
- (ii) *$V = \bigoplus_{i=1}^d V_i$ is a sum of 1-spaces and G acts 2-homogeneously on $\{V_1, \dots, V_d\}$.*
- (iii) *$V = V_1 \otimes V_2$ with G permuting V_1 and V_2 transitively, and $\text{Sym}^2(V_i)$ and $\wedge^2(V_i)$ are irreducible over $G_1 := \text{Stab}_G(V_1) \cap \text{Stab}_G(V_2)$ for $i = 1, 2$. Furthermore, G is reducible on $\wedge^3(V)$ if $d \geq 5$.*

Proof. Assume that G is reducible on V and $A \neq 0$ is a proper G -submodule of V . Replacing V by V^* if necessary, we may assume that $\dim(A) \geq 2$. Then $\wedge^2(A) \neq 0$ is a proper G -submodule of $\wedge^2(V)$, a contradiction. Next assume that G is imprimitive on V . Then $V = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n V_i$ with G permuting the subspaces V_i 's transitively. If $\dim(V_i) \geq 2$, then $\bigoplus_{i=1}^n \wedge^2(V_i)$ is a proper G -submodule of $\wedge^2(V)$, a contradiction. If $\dim(V_i) = 1$, then the irreducibility of $\wedge^2(V)$ implies that the T -module V_i 's are all nonisomorphic T -modules for $T := \bigcap_{i=1}^d \text{Stab}_G(V_i)$, and the permutation action of G on $\{V_1, \dots, V_d\}$ is 2-homogeneous.

Now assume that the G -module V is tensor decomposable. Then $V = A \otimes B$ as a G -module, with $\dim A, \dim B > 1$. Clearly, $\text{Sym}^2(A) \otimes \wedge^2(B)$ is a proper G -submodule of $\wedge^2(V)$, again a contradiction.

Finally, assume that the G -module V is tensor induced. In this case, $V = \bigotimes_{i=1}^n V_i$ with G permuting the subspaces V_i 's transitively, and $\dim(V_i) \geq 2$. Hence, $\wedge^2(V)$ contains the proper G -submodule

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (\text{Sym}^2(V_1) \otimes \dots \otimes \text{Sym}^2(V_{i-1}) \otimes \wedge^2(V_i) \otimes \text{Sym}^2(V_{i+1}) \otimes \dots \otimes \text{Sym}^2(V_n)),$$

a contradiction, unless $n = 2$. Consider the case $n = 2$. Since

$$\wedge^2(V_1 \otimes V_2) \simeq (\text{Sym}^2(V_1) \otimes \wedge^2(V_2)) \oplus (\wedge^2(V_1) \otimes \text{Sym}^2(V_2))$$

as G_1 -modules and $(G : G_1) = 2$, $\text{Sym}^2(V_i)$ and $\wedge^2(V_i)$ must be irreducible over G_1 . Finally, assume $d \geq 5$. Then $\dim(V_1) = \dim(V_2) \geq 3$, and

$$\wedge^3(V_1 \otimes V_2) \simeq (\text{Sym}^3(V_1) \otimes \wedge^3(V_2)) \oplus (\wedge^3(V_1) \otimes \text{Sym}^3(V_2)) \oplus (\mathbf{S}_{(2,1)}(V_1) \otimes \mathbf{S}_{(2,1)}(V_2))$$

as G_1 -modules, whence $\wedge^3(V)$ is reducible over G . $\square$

Note that both exceptions listed in Lemma 2.4(ii), (iii) do occur.

Lemma 2.5. *Assume $G \leq GL(V)$ is an irreducible, primitive and tensor indecomposable subgroup, and $H \triangleleft G$. Then H is either central in G or irreducible on V .*

Proof. By Clifford theory, the H -module V has only one isotypic component, i.e. $V|_H = eW$ with W an irreducible H -module. If $f := \dim(W) = 1$ then $H \leq Z(G)$.

So assume $e, f > 1$. Let Φ , resp. Ψ , denote the representation of G on V , resp. of H on W . In a suitable basis of V , $\Phi(g) = (g_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq e}$ with $g_{ij} \in \text{Mat}_f(\mathbb{F})$ and $\Phi(h) = \text{diag}(\Psi(h), \dots, \Psi(h))$ for $g \in G$ and $h \in H$. Since $\Psi^g \simeq \Psi$, $\Psi(ghg^{-1}) = \Theta(g)\Psi(h)\Theta(g)^{-1}$ for some $\Theta(g) \in GL_f(\mathbb{F})$. The identity $\Phi(g)\Phi(h)\Phi(g)^{-1} = \Phi(ghg^{-1})$ now implies that $\Theta(g)^{-1}g_{ij}$ commutes with $\Psi(h)$ for all $h \in H$. By Schur's Lemma, $g_{ij} = \Lambda_{ij}(g)\Theta(g)$ for some $\Lambda_{ij}(g) \in \mathbb{F}^\times$. Thus $\Phi(g) = \Lambda(g) \otimes \Theta(g)$ if we set $\Lambda(g) := (\Lambda_{ij}(g))_{1 \leq i, j \leq e} \in \text{Mat}_e(\mathbb{F})$. In particular, $\Lambda(g) \in GL_e(\mathbb{F})$. We have shown that $\Phi(G) \leq GL_e(\mathbb{F}) \otimes GL_f(\mathbb{F})$. In other words, G is contained in $GL(A) \otimes GL(B)$ for some decomposition $V = A \otimes B$ with $e = \dim(A)$ and $f = \dim(B)$, a contradiction. $\square$

Lemma 2.6. *Let S be a group, and let $V_1, \dots, V_m$ be $\mathbb{F}S$ -modules such that the resulting representation Φ of S on $V := V_1 \otimes \dots \otimes V_m$ is irreducible. Let $g \in GL(V)$ be an element that normalizes $\Phi(S)$.*

- (i) *If $V_i^g \simeq V_i$ for all i , then $g \in K := \otimes_{i=1}^m GL(V_i)$.*
- (ii) *Assume $\dim(V_i) = f$ for all i , and that for every i there is some j such that $V_i^g \simeq V_j$. Then $g \in H := (\otimes_{i=1}^m GL(V_i)) \cdot S_m$.*

Proof. (i) Let Φ_i denote the representation of S on V_i . By assumption, there is $h_i \in GL(V_i)$ such that h_i and g induce the same automorphism on $\Phi_i(S)$. It follows that $h := \otimes_{i=1}^m h_i \in K$ and g induce the same automorphism on $\Phi(S)$. Thus $h^{-1}g$ centralizes $\Phi(S)$ and so it is scalar by irreducibility, whence is in K , and so is g .

(ii) Let Φ_i denote the matrix representation of S relative to a fixed basis of V_i . Without loss we may replace S by $\Phi(S)$, and denote the matrix representation of $\langle S, g \rangle$ on V also by Φ . By assumption, there is an element $\tau \in S_m$ and $h_i \in GL_f(\mathbb{F})$ such that $\Phi_i(gsg^{-1}) = h_i \Phi_{\tau(i)}(s) h_i^{-1}$ for all $s \in S$. We may find an element σ of the subgroup S_m of H such that $\sigma \Phi(s) \sigma^{-1} = \sigma(\otimes_{i=1}^m \Phi_i(s)) \sigma^{-1} = \otimes_{i=1}^m \Phi_{\tau(i)}(s)$ for all $s \in S$. Setting $h := \otimes_{i=1}^m h_i \in H$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(g)\Phi(s)\Phi(g)^{-1} &= \Phi(gsg^{-1}) = \otimes_{i=1}^m h_i \Phi_{\tau(i)}(s) h_i^{-1} \\ &= h(\otimes_{i=1}^m \Phi_{\tau(i)}(s)) h^{-1} = h\sigma\Phi(s)\sigma^{-1}h^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

whence $\sigma^{-1}h^{-1}\Phi(g)$ centralizes $\Phi(s)$ for all $s \in S$. It follows again by irreducibility that $\sigma^{-1}h^{-1}\Phi(g)$ is scalar, and so $\Phi(g) \in H$. $\square$

Slightly abusing the language, in the situations (i) or (ii) of Lemma 2.6 we will say that g permutes the spaces $V_1, \dots, V_m$.

Lemma 2.6(i) is not true without the assumption that G permutes the set of isomorphism classes of $\mathbb{F}S$ -modules $V_1, \dots, V_m$. Indeed, the group $G = Sp_{2n}(5) \cdot 2$ has an irreducible complex representation V such that $V|_S = A \otimes B = A' \otimes B'$ with $S = Sp_{2n}(5)$, A, A' distinct irreducible (Weil) S -modules of dimension $(5^n - 1)/2$ permuted by G , and B, B' distinct irreducible (Weil) S -modules of dimension $(5^n + 1)/2$ permuted by G , cf. [MT1]. However, see [Ra1] for an important case where tensor decomposition of a complex module is uniquely determined.

Corollary 2.7. *Assume $G \leq GL(V)$ and a normal subgroup S of G is a central product of subgroups $H_1, \dots, H_m$, which are permuted by G via conjugation. Assume furthermore that $V|_S = V_1 \otimes \dots \otimes V_m$ is irreducible with each H_i acting on V_i and trivially on V_j for $j \neq i$. Then G also permutes the spaces $V_1, \dots, V_m$.*

Proof. Notice that $V|_{H_i}$ is a direct sum of some copies of V_i . Viewing the V_i as S -modules, we see that G permutes the set of isomorphism classes of $\mathbb{F}S$ -modules $V_1, \dots, V_m$. Hence we are done by Lemma 2.6. $\square$

Now we prove a version of Aschbacher's Theorem [A] which we need in the sequel and which may be applied to other situations as well:

Proposition 2.8. *Assume $V = \mathbb{F}^d$, $\ell := \text{char}(\mathbb{F})$, and $\mathcal{G} \in \{GL(V), Sp(V), GO(V)\}$. Let $G \leq \mathcal{G}$ be a Zariski closed subgroup that satisfies the hypothesis (S). Then there is a subgroup $H \leq \mathcal{G}$ such that $Z(\mathcal{G})G = Z(\mathcal{G})H$, $Z(H)$ is finite, and moreover, one of the following statements holds.*

(i) H° is a simple algebraic group. Furthermore, $V|_{H^\circ}$ is a Frobenius twist of a restricted irreducible module if $\ell > 0$.

(ii) H is finite, S is nonabelian simple, and $S \triangleleft H/Z(H) \leq \text{Aut}(S)$ for some nonabelian simple group S .

(iii) H is finite, and $H \leq N_{\mathcal{G}}(P)$, with $P = Z(P)E$ and E an extraspecial p -group for some $p \neq \ell$; furthermore, $\dim(V) = \sqrt{|E/Z(E)|}$.

Proof. In the case $\mathcal{G} = Sp(V)$ or $GO(V)$, we take $H = G$. If $\mathcal{G} = GL(V)$, then we choose $H = \langle \det(g)^{-1/d}g \mid g \in G \rangle$, which implies $H \leq SL(V)$ and so $Z(H)$ is finite, and $Z(\mathcal{G})G = Z(\mathcal{G})H$.

1) Assume $H^\circ \neq 1$. Since $Z(H)$ is finite, $H^\circ \not\leq Z(H)$, whence $V|_{H^\circ}$ is irreducible (and faithful) by Lemma 2.5. In particular, H° is reductive. Clearly, $Z(H^\circ) \leq Z(H)$ by Schur's Lemma, whence it is finite and so H° is semisimple. Since H acts on the set $\{H_1, \dots, H_n\}$ of simple components of H° , Corollary 2.7 and (S) imply that $n = 1$ and so H° is simple. Finally, if $\ell > 0$ then H acts on the set of isomorphism classes of Steinberg factors of $V|_{H^\circ}$, whence the latter must be restricted (up to a Frobenius twist) by Lemma 2.6 and (S).

2) Now we may assume that H is finite. Let $\bar{L}$ be a minimal normal subgroup of $H/Z(H)$. Here we consider the case $\bar{L}$ is nonabelian; in particular $\bar{L}$ is perfect. Assume that $\bar{M}$ is another minimal normal subgroup of $H/Z(H)$. Consider the complete inverse images M and L of $\bar{M}$ and $\bar{L}$ in G and set $K := L^{(\infty)}$. Notice that $M, K \triangleleft H$, $M, K \not\leq Z(H)$, $[M, K] \leq M \cap K \leq Z(K)$, and $[K, K] = K$. Hence $[[M, K], K] = 1$ and so $[M, K] = 1$ by the Three-Subgroup Lemma. By Lemma 2.5, $V|_K$ is irreducible. But then by Schur's Lemma, $M \leq Z(H)$, a contradiction.

Next we show that $\bar{L}$ is simple. Write $\bar{L} = \bar{S}_1 \times \dots \times \bar{S}_n$, where $\bar{S}_1 \simeq \dots \simeq \bar{S}_n$ are simple. Let S_i be the complete inverse image of $\bar{S}_i$ in H and let $R_i := S_i^{(\infty)}$. Since R_i is perfect and $[R_i, R_j] \leq Z(G)$ for $i \neq j$, as above we can check that $[R_i, R_j] = 1$

for $i \neq j$. Again by Lemma 2.5, $V|_K$ is irreducible; furthermore, $K = R_1 * \dots * R_n$. Hence $V|_K = V_1 \otimes \dots \otimes V_n$, where V_i is an irreducible R_i -module. Notice that H permutes the subgroups R_i 's transitively, whence H permutes the spaces V_i 's transitively by Corollary 2.7. Thus the H -module V is tensor induced if $n > 1$. By Lemma 2.1, $n = 1$ and so $\bar{L} =: S$ is simple. Clearly, $H/Z(H)$ acts on $\bar{L}$, and $C_{H/Z(H)}(\bar{L})$ intersects $\bar{L}$ trivially. But $\bar{L}$ is a unique minimal normal subgroup of $H/Z(H)$, hence $C_{H/Z(H)}(\bar{L}) = 1$. We conclude that $\bar{L} \triangleleft H/Z(H) \leq \text{Aut}(\bar{L})$.

3) Now we may assume that $H/Z(H)$ has an elementary abelian, minimal normal p -subgroup $\bar{L}$ for some prime p . Let R denote the complete inverse image of $\bar{L}$ in H . Then $R' \leq Z(H)$, whence R is nilpotent. In particular, $R = O_p(E) \times O_{p'}(E)$ and $O_{p'}(E) \leq Z(H)$, and so $p \neq \ell$. Let P be the subgroup generated by all elements of R of order p if $p > 2$ and of order 2 or 4 if $p = 2$. Then $P \triangleleft H$ and $P \not\leq Z(H)$. Moreover, by Lemma 2.5 any characteristic abelian subgroup of P is cyclic. It follows that $P = Z(P)E$ for some extraspecial p -group (and either $P = E$, or $|Z(P)| = 4$). By Lemma 2.5, $V|_P$ is irreducible, whence $\dim(V) = \sqrt{|E/Z(E)|}$. $\square$

In what follows, the subgroup H described in Proposition 2.8 will be referred to as the *normalized version* of G and denoted by $G_{\mathbf{n}}$. Notice that $\det(g) = \pm 1$ for all $g \in G_{\mathbf{n}}$.

To deal with self-dual modules, we will need the following two statements.

Lemma 2.9. *Let V be an $\mathbb{F}G$ -module, and let $M, N \leq G$ be such that $V|_{M \cap N}$ is irreducible, $V|_M$ and $V|_N$ are self-dual. Then $V|_{\langle M, N \rangle}$ is also self-dual.*

Proof. By the assumptions, V affords a non-degenerate bilinear form B_M , resp. B_N , which is M -invariant, resp. N -invariant. By irreducibility, $M \cap N$ admits a unique (up to scalar) non-degenerate invariant bilinear form on V . Hence after a suitable rescaling we have $B_M = B_N$ and so B_M is $\langle M, N \rangle$ -invariant. $\square$

Lemma 2.10. *Let $G \leq \mathcal{G} := GL(V)$, and let $N \triangleleft G$ such that $V|_N$ is irreducible and self-dual. Then there is $G^* \leq GL(V)$ such that $N \triangleleft G^*$, $Z(\mathcal{G})G = Z(\mathcal{G})G^*$, and $V|_{G^*}$ is also self-dual.*

Proof. By the assumptions, V affords a (unique up to scalar) non-degenerate N -invariant bilinear form B_N . Since $N \triangleleft G$, each g changes B_N by a scalar $\lambda_g \in \mathbb{F}^\times$, in which case define $g^* = \lambda_g^{-1/2}g$. Now just take $G := \langle g^* \mid g \in G \rangle$. $\square$

Lemma 2.11. *Let G be a finite group, $\varphi \in \text{IBr}_\ell(G)$, and let $N \triangleleft G$ be such that $\varphi|_N$ is irreducible and lifts to a complex character ρ of N . Assume that ρ extends to G . Then φ also lifts to a complex character of G .*

Proof. By assumption, $\rho = \mu|_N$ for some $\mu \in \text{Irr}(G)$. Hence $\hat{\mu}$ is an extension of $\varphi|_N$ to G . By Clifford theory, in this case $\varphi = \alpha \otimes \hat{\mu}$, where $\alpha \in \text{IBr}_\ell(G)$ and $\alpha(1) = 1$. In particular, α is a Brauer character of $A := O_{\ell'}(G/G')$. Now we can view α as a

complex character β of $A \simeq (G/G')/O_\ell(G/G')$ and then of G/G' . Setting $\chi = \beta \otimes \mu$, we see that $\varphi = \widehat{\beta \otimes \mu}$, as stated. $\square$

Lemma 2.12. *Let $N \triangleleft G$, V an $\mathbb{F}G$ -module, and A a submodule of $V|_N$.*

(i) *If $|G/N|$ is a prime and A extends to G , then V contains a simple G -module of dimension $\leq \dim(A)$.*

(ii) *If A is simple and G -invariant, then V contains a simple G -module of dimension at most $m \dim(A)$, where m is the largest degree of projective irreducible $\mathbb{F}(G/N)$ -representations.*

Proof. Consider a simple N -submodule B of A . By assumption, $0 \neq \text{Hom}_N(B, V|_N)$. By Frobenius reciprocity, $\text{Hom}_N(B, V|_N) \simeq \text{Hom}_G(\text{Ind}_N^G(B), V)$.

Consider the case of (i). If B is G -invariant, then B extends to G and all composition factors of $\text{Ind}_N^G(B)$ are of dimension equal to $\dim(B) \leq \dim(A)$; in particular a simple submodule of G has this dimension. Otherwise $\text{Ind}_N^G(B)$ is simple, and embeds in both V and A_1 , an extension of A to G .

In the case of (ii), $B = A$. By Clifford theory, any composition factor of $\text{Ind}_N^G(B)$ is of the form $A_2 \otimes X$ for some projective $\mathbb{F}G$ -representation A_2 of degree $\dim(A)$ and some irreducible projective $\mathbb{F}(G/N)$ -representation X , whence the claim follows. $\square$

We will discard the groups G with a normal subgroup contained in $GO(V)$ as follows:

Lemma 2.13. *Assume $G \leq GL(V)$ has a normal subgroup $N \leq GO(V)$.*

(i) *Then the N -module $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ contains a submodule isomorphic to 1_N if k is even, and $V|_N$ if k is odd.*

(ii) *Assume $|N| > 2$ and $\dim(V) \geq 2$. Then $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ cannot be irreducible over G for any $k \geq 2$.*

Proof. (i) We realize $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ as the space P_k of homogeneous polynomials of degree k in variables $x_1, \dots, x_d$, with $V = \langle x_1, \dots, x_d \rangle_{\mathbb{F}}$ as a $GO(V)$ -module (and equipped with the standard scalar product). Notice that $h := \sum_{i=1}^d x_i^2$ is $GO(V)$ -invariant, and so the map $f \mapsto hf$ yields an injective $GO(V)$ -homomorphism $P_{k-2} \hookrightarrow P_k$ (as $\mathbb{F}[x_1, \dots, x_d]$ is an integral domain). Hence the claim follows.

(ii) Assume the contrary: $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ is irreducible for some $k \geq 2$. By Lemmas 2.1 and 2.5, $\ell > 2$ and N acts either scalarly or irreducibly on V . In the former case, $|N| \leq 2$ as $N \leq GO(V)$, a contradiction. Hence N is irreducible on V . By (i) applied to the subgroup G^* constructed in Lemma 2.10, $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ has an G^* -submodule A of dimension 1 if k is even and dimension $\dim(V)$ if k is odd. Since $\mathbb{F}^\times$ acts scalarly on $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ and $\dim(V) \geq 2$, A is a proper G -submodule in $\text{Sym}^k(V)$, a contradiction. $\square$

The main reduction is provided by the following:

Proposition 2.14. *Assume $\mathcal{G} := GL(V)$, $Sp(V)$ or $GO(V)$, $d := \dim(V) \geq 2$, $G \leq \mathcal{G}$ is Zariski closed, and that $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ is irreducible over G for some $k \geq 2$. Then $G \not\leq GO(V)$ and $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ is irreducible over $H := G_{\mathbf{n}}$. Moreover, $G_{\mathbf{n}}$ satisfies one of the conclusions (i) – (iii) of Proposition 2.8.*

Proof. The claim $G \not\leq GO(V)$ follows from Lemma 2.13. By Lemma 2.1, G satisfies (S). Now one just applies Proposition 2.8. $\square$

The following simple argument is useful in various situations:

Lemma 2.15. *Let H be a subgroup of a finite group G , and V an irreducible $\mathbb{F}G$ -module of dimension d .*

(i) *Assume that any irreducible ℓ -modular Brauer character of H of degree $\leq d$ is of type +. If $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ is irreducible for some $k \geq 2$, then $\dim(\text{Sym}^k(V)) \leq (G : Z(G)H)$ if k is even, and $\dim(\text{Sym}^k(V)) \leq d(G : Z(G)H)$ if k is odd.*

(ii) *Assume $V|_H$ contains the submodule $B \oplus B^*$ for some H -module B . If $\wedge^k(V)$ is irreducible for some even $k \leq 2 \dim(B)$, then $\dim(\wedge^k(V)) \leq (G : Z(G)H)$.*

Proof. (i) Consider a simple submodule U of $V|_H$. By assumption, U is of type +. Hence by Lemma 2.13, $\text{Sym}^k(V)|_H$ contains a submodule A , where $A = 1_H$ if k is even and $A \simeq U$ if k is odd. By Lemma 2.1, $Z(G)$ acts scalarly on V and on $\text{Sym}^k(V)$, so we may view A as a $Z(G)H$ -module. Now the claim follows by Frobenius' reciprocity.

(ii) Clearly, $\wedge^k(V)|_H \supset \wedge^{k/2}(B) \otimes \wedge^{k/2}(B^*) \simeq \wedge^{k/2}(B) \otimes (\wedge^{k/2}(B))^* \supset 1_H$. Thus the H -fixed point subspace on $\wedge^k(V)$ is nonzero, and $Z(G)$ certainly has a 1-dimensional submodule in it, whence the claim again follows by Frobenius' reciprocity. $\square$

If V is a self-dual simple $\mathbb{C}G$ -module, then the type of V can be determined using the Frobenius-Schur indicator. In the modular case, the following result of Thompson is very useful:

Lemma 2.16. [Th] *Let G be a finite group and let $\chi \in \text{Irr}(G)$ be a real-valued character. For an odd prime ℓ , assume that $\varphi \in \text{IBr}_{\ell}(G)$ is a real-valued constituent of odd multiplicity in $\hat{\chi}$. Then φ has the same type as of χ .* $\square$

2.2. Reduction to lower symmetric/exterior powers.

Lemma 2.17. *Assume $k, l \geq 1$ and that either $\text{char}(\mathbb{F}) = 0$, or $\mathcal{G} \in \{GL(V), Sp(V)\}$ and $\text{char}(\mathbb{F}) \geq \max\{k, l\} + 2$. Then $L(k\varpi_1) \otimes L(l\varpi_1)^*$ embeds in $L((k+1)\varpi_1) \otimes L((l+1)\varpi_1)^*$ as a $\mathcal{G}$ -submodule.*

Proof. First we assume $\mathcal{G} = GL(V)$. Let $P_{l,k}$ be the subspace of $\mathbb{F}[x_1, \dots, x_d, y_1, \dots, y_d]$ consisting of homogeneous polynomials of degree l in $x_1, \dots, x_d$ and of degree k in $y_1, \dots, y_d$. Furthermore, let $GL(V)$ act naturally on $\mathbb{F}^d$ and let it act on $P_{l,k}$ via $g \cdot f(x, y) = f({}^t g x, g^{-1} y)$. The condition on $\text{char}(\mathbb{F})$ ensures that $L(k\varpi_1) \otimes L(l\varpi_1)^* \simeq P_{l,k}$ and $L((k+1)\varpi_1) \otimes L((l+1)\varpi_1)^* \simeq P_{l+1,k+1}$. Observe that $h := \sum_{i=1}^d x_i y_i$ is

$GL(V)$ -invariant. Also, $\mathbb{F}[x_1, \dots, x_d, y_1, \dots, y_d]$ is an integral domain. So the multiplication by h yields an injective $\mathcal{G}$ -homomorphism $P_{l,k} \hookrightarrow P_{l+1,k+1}$. Notice that, under the given assumptions, the modules $L(m\varpi_1)$ of $GL(V)$ and of $Sp(V)$, with $m \in \{k, l, k+1, l+1\}$, are the same, so we are also done with $Sp(V)$.

Next we consider the case $\mathcal{G} = GO(V)$ and $\text{char}(\mathbb{F}) = 0$. It is proved in [DW] that $L(k\varpi_1) \otimes L(l\varpi_1)^* \simeq P_{l,k} \cap \mathcal{H}$, where

$$\mathcal{H} := \left\{ f(x, y) \in \mathbb{F}[x_1, \dots, x_d, y_1, \dots, y_d] \mid \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_i^2} = \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial y_i^2} = 0 \right\},$$

and that the operator $\sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i \partial y_i}$ yields a surjective $SO(V)$ -homomorphism from $(P_{l+1,k+1} \cap \mathcal{H})$ to $(P_{l,k} \cap \mathcal{H})$. In fact this homomorphism is also a $GO(V)$ -homomorphism. $\square$

The following is a theorem of Serre:

Lemma 2.18. [S] Assume $V_1, \dots, V_m$ are semisimple $\mathbb{F}G$ -modules and $\text{char}(\mathbb{F}) > \sum_{i=1}^m (\dim(V_i) - 1)$. Then the G -module $V_1 \otimes \dots \otimes V_m$ is also semisimple. $\square$

Corollary 2.19. (i) Let G be a subgroup of $GL(V)$. Assume that the G -module $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ is reducible for some $k \geq 1$. Assume furthermore that either $\ell := \text{char}(\mathbb{F}) = 0$ or $\ell > k(\dim(V) - 1)$. Then for every $m \geq k$, the G -module $\text{Sym}^m(V)$ is also reducible.

(ii) Let $\text{char}(\mathbb{F}) = 0$ and let G be any subgroup of $\mathcal{G} := GO(V)$. Assume that the $\mathcal{G}$ -module $L(k\varpi_1)$ is irreducible over G for some $k \geq 1$. Then for every m , $1 \leq m \leq k$, the $\mathcal{G}$ -module $L(m\varpi_1)$ is also irreducible over G .

Proof. Clearly, we may assume $\dim(V) > 1$.

(i) Consider any $m \geq k$. By Lemma 2.1 we may assume that G is irreducible (and faithful) on V and that $\ell > m$. In particular, $\text{Sym}^m(V) = L(m\varpi_1)$. Furthermore, the condition on ℓ implies that the G -module $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ is semisimple by Lemma 2.18. Since $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ is reducible over G , the semisimplicity implies that the fixed point subspace M_k^G has dimension ≥ 2 , where we set

$$M_n := \text{Sym}^n(V) \otimes (\text{Sym}^n(V))^* \simeq \text{Sym}^n(V) \otimes \text{Sym}^n(V^*).$$

But M_k embeds in M_m as a G -module by Lemma 2.17. It follows that $\dim(M_m^G) \geq 2$, and so the G -module $\text{Sym}^m(V)$ is reducible by Schur's Lemma.

(ii) Recall that $L(k\varpi_1)$ is a $\mathcal{G}$ -submodule of $V^{\otimes k}$. First we consider the case the G -module V is semisimple. By Lemma 2.18, the G -module $V^{\otimes k}$ is semisimple, and so is $L(k\varpi_1)$. Now we can apply Lemma 2.17 and argue as above.

Next we consider the general case. If every simple G -submodule of V is non-degenerate (w.r.t. the bilinear form on V), then clearly the G -module V is semisimple and so we are done. Otherwise G preserves a nonzero (and proper) totally singular

subspace W of V . It suffices to show that $\mathcal{H} := \text{Stab}_{\mathcal{G}}(W)$ is reducible on $L(m\varpi_1)$. Let $\mathcal{U}$ be the unipotent radical of $\mathcal{H}$. The kernel of the action of $\mathcal{G}$ on $L(m\varpi_1)$ is obviously normal in $\mathcal{G}$ and therefore has order ≤ 2 . It follows that $\mathcal{U}$ acts nontrivially on $L(m\varpi_1)$ and so its fixed point subspace F on $L(m\varpi_1)$ gives a nonzero proper $\mathcal{H}$ -submodule. $\square$

Similarly, the following statement holds for exterior powers:

Lemma 2.20. *Assume that $(d+1)/2 \geq k \geq 1$ and that either $\ell := \text{char}(\mathbb{F}) = 0$ or $\ell > 2k(d-k)$.*

- (i) *Then $\wedge^{k-1}(V) \otimes \wedge^{k-1}(V)^*$ embeds in $\wedge^k(V) \otimes \wedge^k(V)^*$ as an $SL(V)$ -submodule.*
- (ii) *Assume that $G \leq GL(V)$ and that $\wedge^k(V)$ is irreducible over G . Then for every m with $1 \leq m \leq k$, the G -module $\wedge^m(V)$ is also irreducible.*

Proof. If d is odd and $k = (d+1)/2$ then $\wedge^{k-1}(V) \simeq \wedge^k(V)^*$. So we may assume that $k \leq d/2$.

- (i) First we consider the case $\ell = 0$. Let $\varpi_1, \dots, \varpi_{d-1}$ denote the fundamental weights of $SL(V)$. Using [FH, Prop. 15.25] one can show that

$$\wedge^k(V) \otimes \wedge^k(V)^* = \bigoplus_{0 \leq i \leq k} L(\varpi_i + \varpi_{d-i})$$

as an $SL(V)$ -module. Hence the claim follows.

Now we assume that $\ell > 2k(d-k)$. According to [McN], $\wedge^m(V) \otimes \wedge^m(V^*)$ is semisimple over $\mathcal{G} := SL(V)$ for $1 \leq m \leq k$. Consider the complex Lie group $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbb{C}} = SL_d(\mathbb{C})$ and its natural module $V_{\mathbb{C}} = \mathbb{C}^d$, and label the fundamental weights of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbb{C}}$ in the same way as we did for $\mathcal{G}$. Notice that, for a given highest weight ϖ , the Weyl module $V(\varpi)$ of $\mathcal{G}$ can be obtained by a reduction modulo ℓ of the irreducible module $L_{\mathbb{C}}(\varpi)$ of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbb{C}}$, and $L_{\mathbb{C}}(\varpi_m) = \wedge^m(V_{\mathbb{C}})$. So the above claim applied to the $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbb{C}}$ -module $V_{\mathbb{C}}$ now implies that the multiplicity of each $\mathcal{G}$ -composition factor in $\wedge^{k-1}(V) \otimes \wedge^{k-1}(V)^*$ is at most that of the same composition factor in $\wedge^k(V) \otimes \wedge^k(V)^*$. Hence our claim follows by semisimplicity.

- (ii) As in the proof of Proposition 2.14 we may assume that $G \leq SL(V)$. If G is reducible on V then it is easy to see that G is also reducible on $\wedge^m(V)$. So we may assume G is irreducible on V , whence $\wedge^m(V)$ is semisimple by [McN]. Now argue as in the proof of Corollary 2.19(i). $\square$

Now we provide analogues of Proposition 2.14 and Lemma 2.13 for exterior powers:

Proposition 2.21. *Assume $\mathcal{G} := GL(V)$, $Sp(V)$ or $GO(V)$, $d := \dim(V) \geq 4$, $G \leq \mathcal{G}$ is Zariski closed, and that $\wedge^k(V)$ is irreducible over G for some k , $2 \leq k \leq d/2$. Then $G \not\leq Sp(V)$ and $\wedge^k(V)$ is irreducible over $H := G_{\mathbf{n}}$. Moreover, one of the following statements holds.*

- (a) *G satisfies (S), and H satisfies one of the conclusions (i) – (iii) of Proposition 2.8.*

(b) Either $V = \bigoplus_{i=1}^d V_i$ is a sum of 1-spaces and G acts k -homogeneously on $\{V_1, \dots, V_d\}$, or $k = 2$ and $V = V_1 \otimes V_2$ with G permuting V_1 and V_2 transitively.

Proof. It is well known, cf. [Se1] that $G \not\leq Sp(V)$. By Lemmas 2.4 and 2.20 we may assume that $\ell = \text{char}(\mathbb{F}) > 0$ and that G fails (a). Then G fails the condition (S). Arguing as in the proof of Lemma 2.4 we see that G is irreducible on V . Now G stabilizes an imprimitive decomposition, a tensor decomposition, or a tensor induced decomposition of V . Fix a basis $(e_1, \dots, e_d)$ for V that is compatible with this G -invariant decomposition. Then we use this basis to define the space $V_{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}} := \langle e_1, \dots, e_d \rangle_{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}$ and the R -module $V_R := \langle e_1, \dots, e_d \rangle_R$, where R is the ring of all algebraic integers in $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$. Notice that if π is a maximal ideal of R that contains ℓ , then $R/\pi \simeq \bar{\mathbb{F}}_\ell$ can be embedded in $\mathbb{F}$. Moreover, $V_1 := \langle e_1, \dots, e_d \rangle_{R/\pi}$ and $\wedge^m(V_1)$ can be obtained by reducing V_R and $\wedge^m(V_R)$ modulo π . Now let $\mathcal{H}$, resp. $\mathcal{H}_{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}$, $\mathcal{H}_R$, $\mathcal{H}_1$, denote the stabilizer of the aforementioned G -invariant decomposition in $\mathcal{G}$, resp. in $GL(V_{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}})$, $GL(V_R)$, $GL(V_1)$. Then the action of $\mathcal{H}_1$ on $\wedge^k(V_1)$ can be obtained by reducing modulo π the action of $\mathcal{H}_R$ on $\wedge^k(V_R)$. Since $\wedge^k(V)$ is irreducible over $G \leq \mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{H}_1$ is Zariski dense in $\mathcal{H}$, $\wedge^k(V_1)$ is irreducible over $\mathcal{H}_1$.

On the other hand, the statement in the characteristic zero case applied to $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ implies that $\wedge^k(V_{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}})$ is reducible over $\mathcal{H}_{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}$. Let $U \neq 0$ be a proper $\mathcal{H}_{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}$ -submodule in $\wedge^k(V_{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}})$. Notice that $L = \wedge^k(V_R)$ is the free R -module spanned by w_j of the form $e_{i_1} \wedge \dots \wedge e_{i_k}$, $1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_k \leq d$. Claim that the R -module L/M is torsion free, where $M := U \cap L$. (Indeed, assume $0 \neq r \in R$, $v \in L$ and $rv \in M$. Then $v = r^{-1}rv \in U$ and $v \in L$, whence $v \in M$.) Observe that R is a Bezout domain of dimension 1, i.e. every finitely generated ideal of R is principal and every finitely generated torsion free R -module is free. Since L/M is finitely generated, it follows that L/M has an R -basis $(f_1 + M, \dots, f_s + M)$ for some $f_i \in L$, $1 \leq i \leq s$. Notice that $s > 0$ as otherwise $U \supseteq L$ and so U would not be proper in $\wedge^k(V_{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}})$. Setting $J := \langle f_1, \dots, f_s \rangle_R$, we see that $L = M \oplus J$. Reducing modulo π , we get $L/\pi L = (M + \pi L)/\pi L \oplus (J + \pi L)/\pi L$ as R/π -spaces. Claim that $(M + \pi L)/\pi L \neq 0$. (Indeed, since $U \neq 0$ and $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} = \text{Quot}(R)$, we can find $0 \neq u = \sum_j a_j w_j \in U$ for some $a_j \in R$. Now the ideal of R generated by the a_j is finitely generated and so a principal ideal, say bR with $0 \neq b \in R$. In this case, $b^{-1}u = \sum_j b^{-1}a_j w_j \in M$, and not all $b^{-1}a_j$ can belong to π , whence $b^{-1}u \notin \pi L$.) Consequently, $(M + \pi L)/\pi L$ is a nonzero proper $\mathcal{H}_1$ -invariant subspace in $L/\pi L = \wedge^k(V_1)$, a contradiction. $\square$

Lemma 2.22. Assume $G \leq GL(V)$ has a normal subgroup $N \leq Sp(V)$.

(i) Then the N -module $\wedge^k(V)$, where $1 \leq k \leq \dim(V) - 1$, contains a submodule isomorphic to 1_N if k is even, and $V|_N$ if k is odd.

(ii) Assume N is finite and that $O^\ell(N)$ is not abelian. Then $\wedge^k(V)$ cannot be irreducible over G for any k , $2 \leq k \leq \dim(V) - 2$.

Proof. (i) We fix a symplectic basis $(e_1, \dots, e_d)$ for V with $d := \dim(V)$ and use it to define a complex space $V_{\mathbb{C}}$ and the corresponding symplectic group $Sp(V_{\mathbb{C}})$, as well

as the R -module $V_R := \langle e_1, \dots, e_d \rangle_R$ and the symplectic group $Sp(V_R)$, where R is the ring of all algebraic integers in $\mathbb{C}$. Then the contraction map [FH, p. 260]

$$\partial : v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge v_m \mapsto \sum_{i < j} (v_i, v_j) (-1)^{i+j-1} v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge v_{i-1} \wedge v_{i+1} \wedge \dots \wedge v_{j-1} \wedge v_{j+1} \wedge \dots \wedge v_m$$

is an $Sp(V_{\mathbb{C}})$ -homomorphism $\wedge^k(V_{\mathbb{C}}) \rightarrow \wedge^{k-2}(V_{\mathbb{C}})$. In particular, if $s = \lfloor k/2 \rfloor$ and $r = k - 2s$, then $\partial^k : \wedge^k(V_{\mathbb{C}}) \rightarrow \wedge^r(V_{\mathbb{C}})$ is surjective, where $\wedge^0(V_{\mathbb{C}})$ is defined to be the trivial module $\mathbb{C}$, and we are done if $\text{char}(\mathbb{F}) = 0$. Assume $\ell = \text{char}(\mathbb{F}) > 0$. Observe that $\{e_{i_1} \wedge \dots \wedge e_{i_m} \mid 1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_m \leq d\}$ is a basis for $\wedge^m(V_{\mathbb{C}})$ for each m , and relative to these bases, ∂ has an integer matrix. Let ℓ^c be the highest power of ℓ that divides all the coefficients of the matrix of ∂^s and let $\sigma = \ell^{-c} \partial^s$. Then σ commutes with $Sp(V_R)$. Since the matrix of σ has integer entries, we can use this matrix to define a map $\sigma_1 : \wedge^k(V_1) \rightarrow \wedge^r(V_1)$ that commutes with $Sp(V_1)$, where $V_1 := \langle e_1, \dots, e_d \rangle_{R/\pi}$ and π is a maximal ideal of R containing ℓ . Since $Sp(V_1)$ is Zariski dense in $Sp(V)$, σ_1 is an $Sp(V)$ -homomorphism $\wedge^k(V) \rightarrow \wedge^r(V)$. Since $\wedge^m(V)$ is a self-dual module over $Sp(V)$, we are done.

(ii) We may assume $k \leq d/2$. As mentioned in (i), N has an 1-dimensional trivial submodule but does not act trivially on $\wedge^2(V)$ (otherwise $O^\ell(N) \leq Z(G)$ as shown in the proof of [GT2, Lem. 3.6]), so G is reducible on $\wedge^2(V)$. If $k \geq 3$, we can argue as in the proof of Lemma 2.13(ii), using Proposition 2.21. The only exception that may arise here is that N preserves every component of a decomposition of V into a direct sum of 1-spaces; but in this case $N = O^\ell(N)$ is abelian. $\square$

3. THE DEFINING CHARACTERISTIC CASE

Theorem 3.1. *Assume $G \leq \mathcal{G} := GL(V)$ is Zariski closed and $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ is irreducible over G for some $k \geq 2$.*

(i) *Assume that $G_{\mathbf{n}}^\circ$ is a simple algebraic group. Then $G_{\mathbf{n}}^\circ = SL(V)$ or $Sp(V)$.*

(ii) *Assume that $\ell > 0$ and that $\bar{L} \triangleleft G_{\mathbf{n}}/Z(G_{\mathbf{n}}) \leq \text{Aut}(\bar{L})$ for a nonabelian simple group $\bar{L} \in \text{Lie}(\ell)$. Then $S \triangleleft G_{\mathbf{n}} \leq N_{\mathcal{G}}(S)$ with $S = SL_d(q)$, $SU_d(q)$, or $Sp_d(q)$, for some power $q = \ell^a$ and $d = \dim(V)$.*

Proof. (i) By Proposition 2.14 (and Proposition 2.8(i)), we know that $V|_{\mathcal{H}} = L(\varpi)$, an irreducible module with (restricted if $\ell > 0$) highest weight ϖ , where $\mathcal{H} := G_{\mathbf{n}}^\circ$ and we fix a maximal torus $\mathcal{T}$ of $\mathcal{H}$. Then $k\varpi$ is the highest weight in $\text{Sym}^k(V)$, and moreover there is a unique (up to scalar) vector v corresponding to the weight $k\varpi$ of $\mathcal{T}$. As usual, we may assume $\ell > k$. Then $L(k\varpi)$ is a composition factor of the $\mathcal{H}$ -module $\text{Sym}^k(V)$. Since $G_{\mathbf{n}}$ normalizes $\mathcal{H}$, ϖ is $G_{\mathbf{n}}$ -invariant, and so is $k\varpi$. By Clifford's Theorem, it follows that every composition factor of the $\mathcal{H}$ -module $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ is isomorphic to $L(k\varpi)$. But then the uniqueness of v implies that $\text{Sym}^k(V)|_{\mathcal{H}} \simeq L(k\varpi)$ and so $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ is irreducible over $\mathcal{H}$. Now we can apply the fundamental

result of Dynkin [Dyn] (in the case $\ell = 0$) and of Seitz [Se1] (in the case $\ell > 0$, see also [Su]), to $\mathcal{H}$ and conclude that $\mathcal{H} = SL(V)$ or $Sp(V)$.

(ii) Let M be the complete inverse image of $\bar{L}$ in H and let $S := M^{(\infty)}$. Then S is quasisimple. Since $V|_S$ is irreducible by Lemma 2.5, $O_\ell(Z(S)) = 1$. It follows that there is a simple simply connected algebraic group $\mathcal{S}$ in characteristic ℓ and a Frobenius map F on $\mathcal{S}$ such that S is a quotient of $\mathcal{S}^F$. Without loss we may assume that $S = \mathcal{S}^F$. Since $G_{\mathbf{n}}$ preserves the set of isomorphism classes of Steinberg factors of $V|_S$, Lemmas 2.6 and 2.1 imply that $V|_S$ is a Frobenius twist of a restricted module. So without loss we may assume that $V|_S = L(\varpi)|_S$ for some irreducible $\mathcal{S}$ -module $L(\varpi)$ with restricted highest weight ϖ . Let $\Phi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow GL(V)$ be the representation afforded by $L(\varpi)$ (where we identify the spaces $L(\varpi)$ and V) and let $\mathcal{L} := \Phi(\mathcal{S})$. Also let $q = \ell^a$ be the absolute value of eigenvalues of F .

Recall that $\ell > k \geq 2$. Notice that $(\mathcal{S}, \ell) \neq (G_2, 3)$. (For otherwise $V|_S$ is self-dual and furthermore it has odd dimension by [JLPW], whence $\Phi(S) \leq SO(V)$). Since $k = 2$ in this case, we get a contradiction by Lemma 2.13.)

Consider an arbitrary (rational) representation of $\mathcal{S}$ on V that extends $\Phi|_S$, say yielding an irreducible module $L(\gamma)$ with highest weight γ . Claim that this representation has image equal to $\mathcal{L}$.

As shown in [MT1], [Se1, (1.6)] (and the assumption on ℓ) implies that $L(\varpi)|_S$ is tensor indecomposable. Observe that $\gamma = p^m \beta$ for some restricted weight β . Otherwise using Steinberg's tensor product theorem we would see that $L(\varpi)|_S = L(\gamma)|_S$ is tensor decomposable. Now if F is untwisted, then the equality $L(\varpi)|_S = L(\gamma)|_S$ implies by the classification of irreducible S -modules that $\gamma = q^b \varpi$ for some integer $b \geq 0$, whence $L(\gamma)$ can be obtained from $L(\varpi)$ by twisting it using the Frobenius twist $(x_{ij}) \mapsto (x_{ij}^q)$ and so the claim follows. If F is twisted, then $F = q\rho$ and ρ induces an automorphism σ of $\mathcal{S}$. In this case, $L(q\beta)|_S = L(\rho^{-1}(\beta))|_S$, whence by the classification of irreducible S -modules we obtain $\gamma = q^b \rho^c \varpi$ for some integers $b, c \geq 0$. Thus $L(\gamma)$ can be obtained from $L(\varpi)$ by twisting it using the Frobenius twist $(x_{ij}) \mapsto (x_{ij}^q)$ and the automorphism σ , whence our claim follows.

Next we show that $G_{\mathbf{n}} \leq N_{GL(V)}(\mathcal{L})$. Indeed, for any $g \in G_{\mathbf{n}}$ the representation $x \mapsto g\Phi(x)g^{-1}$ of $\mathcal{S}$ on V extends $(\Phi|_S)^g \simeq \Phi|_S$ and so has image equal to $\mathcal{L}$ by our claim. Thus $g\mathcal{L}g^{-1} = \mathcal{L}$. Since $N_{GL(V)}(\mathcal{L}) = Z(\mathcal{G}) \cdot N_{SL(V)}(\mathcal{L})$, it now follows that $N_{SL(V)}(\mathcal{L})$ is also irreducible on $\text{Sym}^k(V)$. Notice that the irreducibility of $V|_S$ and the simplicity of $\mathcal{S}$ implies that $\mathcal{L}$ is a quotient of $\mathcal{S}$ by a finite subgroup, and that $\mathcal{L}$ has finite index in $N_{SL(V)}(\mathcal{L})$; in particular, $N_{SL(V)}(\mathcal{L})^\circ = \mathcal{L}$. Applying (i) to $N_{SL(V)}(\mathcal{L})$, we see that $\mathcal{L} = SL(V)$ or $Sp(V)$. As $\mathcal{S}$ is simply connected, we get $\mathcal{S} = SL(V)$ or $Sp(V)$. Taking the F -fixed points, we obtain $S = SL_d(q)$, $SU_d(q)$, or $Sp_d(q)$. $\square$

Now we provide an analogue of Theorem 3.1 for exterior powers:

Proposition 3.2. *Assume $G \leq \mathcal{G} := GL(V)$ is Zariski closed, and that $\wedge^k(V)$ is irreducible over G for some k , where $d/2 \geq k \geq 2$. Assume furthermore that either $\ell = 0$, or $\ell > 2k(d - k)$, or $k = 2$. Assume in addition that $G_{\mathbf{n}}^{\circ}$ is a simple algebraic group. Then one of the following holds.*

- (i) $G_{\mathbf{n}}^{\circ} = SL(V)$ or $SO(V)$.
- (ii) $k = 2$ and $(G_{\mathbf{n}}^{\circ}, \mathcal{G})$ has type $(A_n, A_{n(n+3)/2})$ or $(A_n, A_{(n-1)(n+2)/2})$.
- (iii) $k \leq 3$ and $(G_{\mathbf{n}}^{\circ}, \mathcal{G})$ has type (D_5, A_{15}) .
- (iv) $k \leq 4$ and $(G_{\mathbf{n}}^{\circ}, \mathcal{G})$ has type (E_6, A_{26}) .

In particular, if $G \not\leq SL(V)$ then $\text{Sym}^2(V)$ is reducible over G .

Proof. Set $\mathcal{H} := G_{\mathbf{n}}^{\circ}$. Since $V|_{\mathcal{H}}$ is irreducible, $C_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{H}) = Z(\mathcal{G})$. If $G_{\mathbf{n}} \leq Z(\mathcal{G})\mathcal{H}$, then $\wedge^k(V)$ is irreducible over $\mathcal{H}$ and we can apply the results of [Se1] (see also [Su]) and arrive at (i) – (iv). Assume $G_{\mathbf{n}} \not\leq Z(\mathcal{G})\mathcal{H}$ and $G_{\mathbf{n}}^{\circ} \neq SO(V)$. We claim that $V|_{\mathcal{H}}$ is self-dual in this case. (For, in the case $\mathcal{H}$ is of type D_{2m} the claim follows from [KLL, Prop. 5.4.3]. In all the remaining cases, $G_{\mathbf{n}}$ induces an outer automorphism φ of $\mathcal{H}$ which stabilizes $V|_{\mathcal{H}}$. Moreover, modulo inner automorphisms of $\mathcal{H}$, φ is just an involutive graph automorphism of $\mathcal{H}$, and φ sends any (finite dimensional) irreducible $\mathbb{F}\mathcal{H}$ -module to its dual. It follows that $V|_{\mathcal{H}}$ is self-dual in this case as well.) We will replace G by $G_{\mathbf{n}}^*$ using the construction in Lemma 2.10. Notice that now $\mathcal{H} = G^{\circ}$ and $G \leq Sp(V)$ or $G \leq GO(V)$. The former case is impossible, as otherwise G is reducible on $\wedge^k(V)$. In the latter case, $\wedge^2(V)$ can be identified with the adjoint module $Lie(SO(V))$, which contains $Lie(\mathcal{H})$ as a G -submodule. By our assumptions, $\dim(\mathcal{H}) < \dim(SO(V))$ and so G is reducible on $\wedge^2(V)$; in particular, $k > 2$. But this contradicts Lemma 2.20(ii). The final statement follows from Theorem 3.1. $\square$

Remark 3.3. An extension of Seitz’s results [Se1] to the disconnected (simple) case has been made in [Fo]. However, we cannot apply results of [Fo] to determine the disconnected subgroups G of $GL(V)$ such that G° is simple and some $W \in \{\text{Sym}^k(V), \wedge^k(V)\}$ is irreducible over G , as [Fo] imposes the condition that all G° -composition factors of W have restricted highest weights.

4. THE CROSS CHARACTERISTIC CASE

The aim of this section is to prove the following theorem:

Theorem 4.1. *Theorem 1.1 holds true in the case where G is finite, $S := \text{soc}(G/Z(G))$ is a finite simple group of Lie type in characteristic p , and $\text{char}(\mathbb{F}) = \ell \neq p$.*

Let $L = G^{(\infty)}$ be the perfect inverse image of S in G .

4.1. Generalities. Usually, G contains a p -subgroup of *special type*, that is, $[Q, Q] = Z(Q) = \Phi(Q)$ has exponent p and $[x, Q] = Z(Q)$ for all $x \in Q \setminus Z(Q)$. In particular, $|Q/Z(Q)| \geq 4$. Moreover, $Z(Q)$ is a long-root subgroup of G , and $P := N_G(Q) =$

$N_G(Z(Q))$ is a parabolic subgroup of G . Let

$$\Omega(V) := \{\lambda \in \text{IBr}_\ell(Z(Q)) \mid \lambda \text{ occurs in } V|_{Z(Q)}\}, \quad \Omega^*(V) := \Omega(V) \setminus \{1_{Z(Q)}\}.$$

For any $\lambda \in \Omega(V)$, let V_λ be the λ -eigenspace for $Z(Q)$ on V . Also let $d_\lambda(V) := \dim(V_\lambda)/\sqrt{|Q/Z(Q)|}$ for $\lambda \in \Omega^*(V)$. Given any nontrivial $\lambda \in \text{IBr}_\ell(Z(Q))$, there is a unique irreducible $\mathbb{F}Q$ -module Q_λ on which each $z \in Z(Q)$ acts as the scalar $\lambda(z)$ and in fact Q_λ affords the $Z(Q)$ -character $\sqrt{|Q/Z(Q)|}\lambda$, cf. [LS, Lem. 2.3]. We will consider the following condition imposed on $C_G(Z(Q))$:

($\star$) : Q_λ extends to an $\mathbb{F}C_G(Z(Q))$ -module E_λ .

The key ingredient of our treatment of the cross characteristic case is the following:

Proposition 4.2. *Let G be a finite group with a p -subgroup Q of special type and $\text{char}(\mathbb{F}) \neq p$. Assume $C := C_G(Z(Q))$ satisfies the condition ($\star$). Let V be an $\mathbb{F}G$ -module such that there is a $\lambda \in \text{IBr}_\ell(Z(Q))$ with $\lambda, \lambda^{-1} \in \Omega^*(V)$ and $\lambda^{-1} \neq \lambda$.*

(i) *Then $\text{Sym}^{2k}(V)$ has a C -submodule F of dimension*

$$\binom{d_\lambda(V) + k - 1}{k} \cdot \binom{d_{\lambda^{-1}}(V) + k - 1}{k}.$$

(ii) *Assume that $\text{Sym}^n(V)$ is irreducible over G for some $n \geq 4$, and in addition that $|\Omega(V)| \geq 3$ if n is odd. Then $|Q/Z(Q)|^2 < (3/2) \cdot (G : C)$.*

Proof. Since $\text{char}(\mathbb{F}) \neq p$, we can write $V = \left(\bigoplus_{\mu \in \Omega(V)} V_\mu\right) \oplus V_1$, where 1 stands for $1_{Z(Q)}$ for short. Clearly, $V_\lambda|_Q$ is the direct sum of $d_\lambda(V)$ copies of Q_λ . Hence the condition ($\star$) implies that $V_\lambda = E_\lambda \otimes A$ for some C/Q -module A . Without loss we may choose $E_{\lambda^{-1}}$ to be E_λ^* , the dual of E_λ . Then, again by ($\star$), $V_{\lambda^{-1}} = E_\lambda^* \otimes B$ for some C/Q -module B . Denote $E := \dim(E_\lambda) = \sqrt{|Q/Z(Q)|} \geq 2$, $a := \dim(A) \geq 1$, $b := \dim(B) \geq 1$, $c := a + b$, and $v := \dim(V_\nu)$ if there exists $\nu \in \Omega(V) \setminus \{\lambda, \lambda^{-1}\}$. Clearly, $\dim(V) \geq Ec + v$ and $ab(a+1)(b+1) \leq c^4/4$.

(i) Observe that $\text{Sym}^{2k}(V)|_C$ contains the submodules

$$\text{Sym}^k(E_\lambda \otimes A) \otimes \text{Sym}^k(E_\lambda^* \otimes B) \supset \text{Sym}^k(E_\lambda) \otimes \text{Sym}^k(E_\lambda^*) \otimes \text{Sym}^k(A) \otimes \text{Sym}^k(B).$$

Since $\text{Sym}^k(E_\lambda^*) \simeq \text{Sym}^k(E_\lambda)^*$, $\text{Sym}^{2k}(V)|_C$ contains the submodule $F := \text{Sym}^k(A) \otimes \text{Sym}^k(B)$ which obviously has the indicated dimension.

(ii) Now assume that $\text{Sym}^n(V)$ is irreducible over G for some $n \geq 4$. First consider the case $n = 2k$ is even. Then by (i) and by Frobenius' reciprocity, $\dim(\text{Sym}^{2k}(V)) \leq \dim(F) \cdot (G : C)$. Furthermore,

$$\frac{\dim(\text{Sym}^{2k}(V))}{\dim(F)} \geq \frac{\binom{Ec + 2k - 1}{2k}}{\binom{a + k - 1}{k} \cdot \binom{b + k - 1}{k}} \geq \frac{\binom{Ec + 3}{4}}{\binom{a + 1}{2} \cdot \binom{b + 1}{2}} >$$

$$> \frac{(Ec)^4/24}{c^4/16} = \frac{2E^4}{3},$$

proving the claim.

Next we consider the case $n = 2k + 1$ is odd. Then $\text{Sym}^{2k+1}(V)|_C$ contains the submodules

$$\text{Sym}^k(E_\lambda \otimes A) \otimes \text{Sym}^k(E_\lambda^* \otimes B) \otimes V_\nu \supset \text{Sym}^k(E_\lambda) \otimes \text{Sym}^k(E_\lambda^*) \otimes \text{Sym}^k(A) \otimes \text{Sym}^k(B) \otimes V_\nu.$$

It follows that $\text{Sym}^{2k+1}(V)|_C$ contains the submodule $F' := \text{Sym}^k(A) \otimes \text{Sym}^k(B) \otimes V_\nu$. By Frobenius' reciprocity, $\dim(\text{Sym}^{2k+1}(V)) \leq \dim(F') \cdot (G : C)$. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\dim(\text{Sym}^{2k+1}(V))}{\dim(F')} &\geq \frac{\binom{Ec+v+2k}{2k+1}}{\binom{a+k-1}{k} \cdot \binom{b+k-1}{k} \cdot v} \geq \frac{\binom{Ec+v+4}{5}}{\binom{a+1}{2} \cdot \binom{b+1}{2} \cdot v} > \\ &> \frac{(Ec+v)^5/120}{c^4v/16} = E^4 \cdot \frac{16}{120} \cdot \frac{(1+v/Ec)^5}{v/Ec} > \frac{8E^4}{5}, \end{aligned}$$

since $(1+v/Ec)^5 > 12v/Ec$ (indeed, on $(0, +\infty)$ the function $(1+t)^5/t$ attains its minimum at $t = 1/4$). $\square$

Of course, if $p = 2$ then any $\lambda \in \Omega(V)$ is self-dual. In this case we need the following analogue of Proposition 4.2:

Proposition 4.3. *Let G be a finite group with a 2-subgroup Q of special type and $\text{char}(\mathbb{F}) \neq 2$. Let V be an $\mathbb{F}G$ -module such that $\Omega^*(V) \neq \emptyset$. Choose $\lambda \in \Omega^*(V)$ such that $\dim(V_\lambda) = \min\{\dim(V_\mu) \mid \mu \in \Omega^*(V)\}$. Assume that $C := C_G(Z(Q))$ satisfies the condition $(\star)$ for λ , and that E_λ is of type $+$.*

(i) *Then $\text{Sym}^{2k}(V)$ has a C -submodule F of dimension $\binom{d_\lambda(V) + 2k - 1}{2k}$.*

(ii) *Assume that $\text{Sym}^n(V)$ is irreducible over G for some $n \geq 4$ and in addition that $|\Omega(V)| \geq 2$ if n is odd. Then $|Q/Z(Q)|^2 < (15/2) \cdot (G : C)$ if $\dim(V) \geq 2 \dim(E_\lambda)$, and $|Q/Z(Q)|^2 < 24 \cdot (G : C)$ otherwise.*

Proof. As in the proof of Proposition 4.2, we can write $V = \left(\bigoplus_{\mu \in \Omega(V)} V_\mu \right) \oplus V_1$, and $V_\lambda = E_\lambda \otimes A$ for some C/Q -module A . By Lemma 2.13(i), $\text{Sym}^{2k}(E_\lambda)$ contains the submodule 1_C as E_λ is of type $+$. Hence $\text{Sym}^{2k}(V)|_C$ contains the submodules

$$\text{Sym}^{2k}(E_\lambda \otimes A) \supset \text{Sym}^{2k}(E_\lambda) \otimes \text{Sym}^{2k}(A) \supset F := \text{Sym}^{2k}(A),$$

proving (i). Denote $E := \dim(E_\lambda) = \sqrt{|Q/Z(Q)|} \geq 2$, $a := \dim(A) \geq 1$, and $v := \dim(V_\nu)$ if there exists $\nu \in \Omega(V) \setminus \{\lambda\}$, and $d := \dim(V)$ as usual. Then $d \geq Ea + v$.

Now assume that $\text{Sym}^n(V)$ is irreducible over G for some $n \geq 4$. First consider the case $n = 2k$ is even. Then by (i) and by Frobenius' reciprocity, $\dim(\text{Sym}^{2k}(V)) \leq \dim(F) \cdot (G : C)$. Furthermore,

$$\frac{\dim(\text{Sym}^{2k}(V))}{\dim(F)} = \frac{\binom{d+2k-1}{2k}}{\binom{a+2k-1}{2k}} \geq \frac{\binom{d+3}{4}}{\binom{a+3}{4}} > \frac{(Ea)^4 \cdot (d/Ea)^4}{a(a+1)(a+2)(a+3)},$$

which is at least $2E^4/15$ if $a \geq 2$ or if $a = 1$ and $d \geq 2E$, and at least $E^4/24$ if $a = 1$ and $d < 2E$. Hence (ii) follows. In fact we can replace the constant $2/15$ in (ii) by $2/9$ if $d \geq 5E/2$, and we will need this remark later.

Next we consider the case $n = 2k + 1$ is odd. Then $\text{Sym}^{2k+1}(V)|_C$ contains the submodules

$$\text{Sym}^{2k}(E_\lambda \otimes A) \otimes V_\nu \supset \text{Sym}^{2k}(E_\lambda) \otimes \text{Sym}^{2k}(A) \otimes V_\nu.$$

It follows that $\text{Sym}^{2k+1}(V)|_C$ contains the submodule $F' := \text{Sym}^{2k}(A) \otimes V_\nu$. By Frobenius' reciprocity, $\dim(\text{Sym}^{2k+1}(V)) \leq \dim(F') \cdot (G : C)$. Furthermore,

$$\frac{\dim(\text{Sym}^{2k+1}(V))}{\dim(F')} = \frac{\binom{d+2k}{2k+1}}{\binom{a+2k-1}{2k} \cdot v} \geq \frac{\binom{d+4}{5}}{\binom{a+3}{4} \cdot v},$$

which is at least

$$\frac{(Ea+v)^5/120}{(15/2) \cdot a^4 v/24} = E^4 \cdot \frac{4}{150} \cdot \frac{(1+v/Ea)^5}{v/Ea} > \frac{16E^4}{50}$$

if $a \geq 2$ (since $(a+1)(a+2)(a+3) \leq (15/2) \cdot a^3$ and $(1+v/Ea)^5 > 12v/Ea$). If $a = 1$, then

$$\frac{\dim(\text{Sym}^{2k+1}(V))}{\dim(F')} > \frac{d^5}{120v} > E^4 \cdot \frac{(d/E)^4 \cdot (d/v)}{120},$$

which is at least $2E^4/15$ if $d \geq 2E$ (in fact at least $2E^4/9$ if $d \geq 5E/2$), and at least

$$\frac{(E+v)^5}{120v} = E^4 \cdot \frac{1}{120} \cdot \frac{(1+v/E)^5}{v/E} > \frac{E^4}{10},$$

if $d < 2E$. □

Next we will verify various conditions set in Propositions 4.2 and 4.3. *Weil representations* of symplectic groups will account for most exceptions where not all the conditions are met; we refer to [GMST] for necessary information about them.

Lemma 4.4. *Let G be a finite (quasi-simple) Lie-type group of simply connected type defined over $\mathbb{F}_q$, $q = p^f$ for a prime p , Z a long-root subgroup of G , and let V be any nontrivial irreducible $\mathbb{F}G$ -representation. Then one of the following holds.*

- (i) $p > 2$, $\Omega^*(V) = \text{IBr}_\ell(Z) \setminus \{1_Z\}$, $|\Omega(V)| \geq 3$, and there are $\lambda, \lambda^{-1} \in \Omega^*(V)$ with $\lambda \neq \lambda^{-1}$.
- (ii) $p = 2$, $\Omega^*(V) = \text{IBr}_\ell(Z) \setminus \{1_Z\}$, $|\Omega(V)| \geq 2$, and $\Omega^*(V) \neq \emptyset$.
- (iii) $p > 2$, $q \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$, $G = Sp_{2n}(q)$, V is a Weil representation of G , $|\Omega(V)| \geq 3$, and there are $\lambda, \lambda^{-1} \in \Omega^*(V)$ with $\lambda \neq \lambda^{-1}$.
- (iv) $p > 2$, $q \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$, $G = Sp_{2n}(q)$, and V is a Weil representation of G .
- (v) $G \in \{SL_2(5), SU_3(3), Sp_4(3)\}$.

Proof. Let $\Omega^* := \text{IBr}_\ell(Z) \setminus \{1_Z\}$. First we consider the case $p = 2$. Then $\Omega^*(V) = \Omega^*$ and $|\Omega(V)| \geq 2$ by [MMT, Lem. 2.9], and we arrive at (ii). Assume $p > 2$. Clearly (i) holds if $\Omega(V) = \text{IBr}_\ell(Z)$. Otherwise by [MMT, Lem. 2.9] and [GMST], one of the following cases hold.

Case 1: $q > p$ and $\Omega(V) = \Omega^*$. In this case (i) holds.

Case 2: $G = SU_3(p)$ and $\Omega(V) = \Omega^*$. Then either (i) holds or $G = SU_3(3)$.

Case 3: $G = Sp_{2n}(q)$, $n \geq 1$, and either V is a Weil representation and $|\Omega(V)| = (q+1)/2$, or $n \leq 2$ and $\Omega(V) = \Omega^*$, or $n = 1$ and $|\Omega(V)| = (q-1)/2$. In fact the possibilities for $\Omega(V)$ were described in [MMT, p. 386].

Assume $q \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$. If $n \geq 2$, or if $n = 1$ but $q \geq 9$, then either (i) or (iii) holds. Otherwise $G = SL_2(5)$.

Assume $q \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$, but (iv) does not hold. If $n = 2$, then either (i) holds, or $G = Sp_4(3)$. The case $n = 1$ is now impossible as $G \neq SL_2(3)$. $\square$

Proposition 4.5. *Let G be a finite (quasi-simple) Lie-type group of simply connected type in characteristic p , Z a long-root subgroup of G , $C := C_G(Z)$, and $Q := O_p(C)$. Assume that $G \notin \{SL_2(p^f), SU_3(3), Sp_4(3)\}$. If $p = 2$, assume that G is not of types 2B_2 , B_n , C_n , F_4 , or 2F_4 . If $p = 3$, assume that G is not of types G_2 and 2G_2 . Let V be any nontrivial irreducible $\mathbb{F}G$ -representation.*

- (i) *Then C satisfies $(\star)$ for any $\lambda \in \Omega^*(V)$.*
- (ii) *Assume $p = 2$ and $\lambda \in \Omega^*(V)$. If G is not of type ${}^2A_{2n}$, then E_λ can be chosen to have type $+$. Otherwise E_λ can be chosen of type $-$.*

Proof. The assumption on G implies that Q is of special type. We will frequently aim to show that there is a character $\chi \in \text{Irr}(G)$ afforded by a $\mathbb{Q}G$ -module W such that for any nontrivial $\lambda \in \text{Irr}(Z)$ the λ -eigenspace W_λ of Q on W has dimension equal to $E := \sqrt{|Q/Z|}$. Since W_λ is clearly C -invariant, it then follows that E_λ can be taken to be the reduction modulo ℓ of the C -module W_λ . Moreover, if $p = 2$ then, since $\lambda = \lambda^{-1}$ and W is rational, W_λ is of type $+$ and so is E_λ . Denote $\Omega^* := \text{Irr}(Z) \setminus \{1_Z\}$ and $P := N_G(Z)$.

1) Here we consider the symplectic groups $G = Sp_{2n}(q)$ with $q = p^f$. Then $p > 2$, $n \geq 2$, and G has two irreducible Weil characters η_1, η_2 of degree $(q^n - 1)/2$ which together afford all irreducible characters of Z . Restricting them to C , we obtain (i).

Next let $G = SU_n(q)$ with $n \geq 3$. Then G has a rational-valued irreducible Weil character $\zeta_{n,q}^0$ of degree $(q^n - (-1)^n q)/(q+1)$, cf. [TZ2]. Since $(\zeta_{n,q}^0|_Z, \lambda)_Z = q^{n-2} = E$ for all $\lambda \in \Omega^*$, we arrive at (i). Assume in addition that $p = 2$. We will show that $\zeta_{n,q}^0$ has Schur index 1 over $\mathbb{R}$ if n is even, and 2 if n is odd. The claim is clear when $n = 2$ as $\zeta_{2,q}^0$ is the Steinberg character and when $n = 3$ as $\zeta_{3,q}^0$ is the cuspidal unipotent character, see [Ge]. When $n \geq 4$, one can check that $C \geq C' := Q : SU_{n-2}(q)$ and $\zeta_{n,q}^0|_{C'}$ contains $\zeta_{n-2,q}^0$ (inflated from $SU_{n-2}(q)$ to C') with multiplicity 1, so we are done by induction hypothesis.

Assume $G = SL_n(q)$ with $n \geq 3$. Then the doubly transitive action of G on 1-spaces of its natural module affords the character $1 + \tau$ with $\tau(1) = (q^n - q)/(q - 1)$, and $\tau(t) = (q^{n-1} - q)/(q - 1)$ for $1 \neq t \in Z$. It follows that $(\tau|_Z, \lambda)_Z = q^{n-2} = E$ for all $\lambda \in \Omega^*$, and so we are done.

For the remaining Lie-type groups, any nontrivial irreducible (cross characteristic) character of G affords all $\lambda \in \Omega^*$ with equal multiplicity, since P acts transitively on Ω^* . Assume $G = Spin_{2n+1}(q)$ with $p > 2$. Then G has a nontrivial irreducible character μ of degree $(q^{2n} - 1)/(q^2 - 1)$, cf. [TZ1]. Since $\mu(1) < 2q^{2n-3}(q - 1) = 2E \cdot |\Omega^*|$, we are done. Next, assume $G = Spin_{2n}^\epsilon(q)$ with $n \geq 4$. Then we choose χ to be an irreducible constituent of degree $(q^n - \epsilon)(q^{n-1} + \epsilon q)/(q^2 - 1)$ of the rank 3 permutation character ρ of G acting on the singular 1-spaces of its natural module, cf. [ST]. Since $(\rho, \chi)_G = 1$, χ is rational. Notice that if $q > 2$ then $\chi(1) < 2q^{2n-4}(q - 1) = 2E \cdot |\Omega^*|$ and so we are done. Now assume that $q = 2$. Then $\rho(1) = (2^n - \epsilon)(2^{n-1} + \epsilon)$ and $\rho(t) = 3 + 4(2^{n-2} - \epsilon)(2^{n-3} + \epsilon)$ for $1 \neq t \in Z$. It follows that $(\rho|_Z, \lambda)_Z = 3 \cdot 2^{2n-4} = 3E$. Hence either χ or the other nontrivial constituent ψ of ρ affords $E\lambda$, and so we are done again.

2) Now we handle the exceptional groups of Lie type. Consider the case $G = E_7(q)$. Then we choose χ to be the irreducible character of smallest degree $q\Phi_7\Phi_{12}\Phi_{14}$, cf. [Lu], where Φ_n is the value of the n^{th} cyclotomic polynomial at q . Claim that $(\chi|_Z, \lambda)_Z = E$ for all $\lambda \in \Omega^*$. (Indeed, if $q > 2$ then $\chi(1) < 2q^{16}(q - 1) = 2E \cdot |\Omega^*|$, whence the claim. Assume $q = 2$ but the claim is false. Since $\chi(1) < 3q^{16}(q - 1) = 3E \cdot |\Omega^*|$, we see that $W_\lambda|_Q$ is the sum of two copies of the unique irreducible representation of degree q^{16} of Q . Notice that $1 \neq t \in Z$ is G -conjugate to some element $t' \in Q \setminus Z$. Since $\chi(t) = \chi(t')$, it follows that χ has to afford some nontrivial linear characters of Q . The lengths of P -orbits on $\text{Irr}(Q/Z)$ are given in [Hof]. It follows that $141,986 = \chi(1) \geq 2^{17} + (2^3 + 1)(2^5 + 1)(2^8 - 1)$, a contradiction.) It remains to prove (ii) for even q . Arguing as above using $\chi(t) = \chi(t')$, one sees that χ affords exactly one P -orbit, of length $(q^3 + 1)(q^5 + 1)(q^8 - 1)$, on nontrivial linear characters of Q . It was shown in [Hof] that the subgroup $L' = \Omega_{12}^+(q)$ of the Levi subgroup L in P cannot act trivially on $C_W(Q)$. Let μ be an irreducible character

of degree > 1 afforded by L on $C_W(Q)$. Then χ is contained in the Harish-Chandra induction $R_L^G(\mu)$. Since χ is unipotent and the Harish-Chandra induction respects Lusztig series, μ is unipotent. Notice that

$$\chi(1) = q^{16}(q-1) + (q^3+1)(q^5+1)(q^8-1) + (q^6-1)(q^5+q)/(q^2-1) + 1$$

and either $\mu(1) = (q^6-1)(q^5+q)/(q^2-1)$ or $\mu(1) > q^{10}$ by [TZ1, Prop. 7.2]. Hence $\mu(1) = (q^6-1)(q^5+q)/(q^2-1)$ and $(\chi|_C, 1_C)_C = 1$. We have shown that χ enters the permutation character $\rho = 1_C^G$ with multiplicity 1, whence χ is rational and (ii) follows.

Next we consider the case $G = E_8(q)$. Then we choose χ to be the irreducible character of smallest degree $q\Phi_4^2\Phi_8\Phi_{12}\Phi_{20}\Phi_{24}$, cf. [Lu]. Arguing as in the case of E_7 , we see that $(\chi|_Z, \lambda)_Z = E$ for all $\lambda \in \Omega^*$, whence (i) is proved. The assertion (ii) follows from a remark on [KIL, p. 203].

Now assume that $G = E_6^\epsilon(q)$, with $\epsilon = +$ for $E_6(q)$ and $\epsilon = -$ for ${}^2E_6(q)$. Then we choose χ to be the irreducible character of smallest degree $q(q^4+1)(q^6+\epsilon q^3+1)$, cf. [Lu]. Arguing as in the case of E_7 , we see that $(\chi|_Z, \lambda)_Z = E$ for all $\lambda \in \Omega^*$, whence (i) is proved. Also, χ is an irreducible constituent of multiplicity 1 of the permutation character $\rho = 1_{P_1}^G$, where P_1 is the parabolic subgroup of G corresponding to the A_5 -subdiagram of E_6 (before twisting if $\epsilon = -$). It follows that χ is rational.

Assume $G = F_4(q)$. Then $p > 2$, and we choose χ to be the irreducible character of smallest degree $q^8 + q^4 + 1$, cf. [Lu]. Since $\chi(1) < 2q^7(q-1) = 2E \cdot |\Omega^*|$, we are done.

Assume $G = {}^3D_4(q)$. Then we choose χ to be the irreducible character of smallest degree $q(q^4 - q^2 + 1)$, cf. [Lu]. Since $\chi(1) < 2q^4(q-1) = 2E \cdot |\Omega^*|$, (i) follows. Assume in addition that q is even. Then the proof of [MMT, Thm. 4.1] shows that $(\chi|_C, 1_C)_C = 1$. Thus χ enters the permutation character $\rho = 1_C^G$ with multiplicity 1, whence χ is rational.

Finally, assume $G = G_2(q)$ with $q \equiv \epsilon = \pm 1 \pmod{3}$ and $q \geq 4$. Then we choose χ to be the irreducible character of smallest degree $q^3 + \epsilon$, cf. [Lu]. Since $\chi(1) < 2q^2(q-1) = 2E \cdot |\Omega^*|$, (i) follows. Assume in addition that q is even. The uniqueness of χ shows that χ is rational-valued. Also, since $\chi(1)$ is odd, χ has Schur index 1 over $\mathbb{Q}$, and so we are done. $\square$

4.2. Non-generic cases. Since the unitary groups $SU_{2n+1}(q)$ with q even fall out from the general scheme of arguments, we handle them separately first.

Proposition 4.6. *Let $S \leq G/Z(G) \leq \text{Aut}(S)$ for the simple group $S = PSU_n(q)$, where either $2 \leq n \leq 5$, or q is even and n is odd. Let V be a faithful irreducible $\mathbb{F}G$ -representation in characteristic ℓ coprime to q of dimension > 4 . Then $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ is reducible for every $k \geq 4$.*

Proof. Assume the contrary: $\text{Sym}^m(V)$ is irreducible for some $m \geq 4$. Then it is clear that

$$(3) \quad \dim(V)^4 < 24\mathfrak{m}(G) .$$

We will also use the estimates $d := \dim(V) \geq \mathfrak{d}(S)$, $\mathfrak{m}(G) \leq \mathfrak{m}(\hat{S}) \cdot |\text{Out}(S)|$, and $|\text{Out}(S)| \leq q(q+1)$, where $\hat{S}$ is the universal cover of S . If

$$(n, q) \in \{(2, 4), (2, 5), (2, 7), (2, 9), (2, 11), (3, 3), (3, 4), (4, 2), (4, 3), (5, 2)\},$$

then using [Atlas] and [JLPW] it is straightforward to check that either (3) cannot hold, or else $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ is reducible for all $k \geq 4$. The same applies to $(n, q) = (5, 3)$, where we use the bound $\mathfrak{m}(S) \leq \mathfrak{m}(GU_5(q)) = q(q+1)(q^4-1)(q^5+1)$ that follows from [Noz]. Henceforth we will assume that (n, q) is none of the above pairs.

1) First let $S = PSL_2(q)$. If $2|q$, then $d = \dim(V) \geq q-1$ and $\mathfrak{m}(G) \leq q(q+1)/2$, violating (3) as $q \geq 8$. If q is odd, then $d = \dim(V) \geq (q-1)/2$ and $\mathfrak{m}(G) \leq 2q(q+1)/9$, violating (3) as $q \geq 13$. If $S = PSU_3(q)$, then $d \geq q(q-1)$ and $\mathfrak{m}(G) \leq 3q(q+1)(q^2-1)$, violating (3) as $q \geq 5$. If $S = PSU_4(q)$, then $d \geq (q^2+1)(q-1)$ and $\mathfrak{m}(G) \leq 4q(q+1)(q^2+1)(q^3+1)$, violating (3) as $q \geq 4$. If $S = PSU_5(q)$, then $d \geq q(q^2+1)(q-1)$ and $\mathfrak{m}(G) \leq 5q(q+1)(q^4-1)(q^5+1)$, violating (3) as $q \geq 4$. So we may assume $n \geq 7$ and q is even.

2) Next we consider the case $n \geq 9$ and $m \geq 6$. Without loss we may assume $L = SU_n(q)$. Consider a long-root subgroup Z_1 of $M = SU_{n-1}(q)$, and its centralizer $C_1 := C_M(Z_1) = Q_1 \cdot (SU_{n-3}(q) \cdot \mathbb{Z}_{q+1})$ in M , of index $q^{n-1}(q^n+1)(q^{n-1}-1)(q^{n-2}+1)/(q+1)$ in L . By Proposition 4.5, the condition $(\star)$ and the assumptions of Proposition 4.3 hold for C_1 as $n-1$ is even. Now we will argue as in the proof of Proposition 4.3, and denote $V_\lambda = E_\lambda \otimes A_1$, $E_1 := \dim(E_\lambda) = \sqrt{|Q_1/Z_1|} = q^{n-3}$, $a_1 := \dim(A_1)$, $v_1 := \dim(V_\nu)$ for some $\nu \in \Omega(V) \setminus \{\lambda\}$.

First assume that $m = 2k$. Then $\text{Sym}^{2k}(V)$ has a C_1 -submodule F of dimension $\binom{d_\lambda(V) + 2k - 1}{2k}$. A simple submodule of F will certainly extend to $Z(G)C_1$. So by Frobenius' reciprocity, $\dim(\text{Sym}^{2k}(V)) \leq \dim(F) \cdot (G : Z(G)C_1)$. Notice that if $a_1 \geq 21$ then $\binom{a_1 + 5}{6} < a_1^6/360$ and so

$$\frac{\dim(\text{Sym}^{2k}(V))}{\dim(F)} = \frac{\binom{d + 2k - 1}{2k}}{\binom{a_1 + 2k - 1}{2k}} \geq \frac{\binom{d + 5}{6}}{\binom{a_1 + 5}{6}} > \frac{(E_1 a_1)^6 \cdot (d/E_1 a_1)^6}{2a_1^6} > E_1^6/2.$$

Next we consider the case $n = 2k + 1$ is odd. Then $\text{Sym}^{2k+1}(V)|_{C_1}$ contains the submodule $F' := \text{Sym}^{2k}(A_1) \otimes V_\nu$. By Frobenius' reciprocity, $\dim(\text{Sym}^{2k+1}(V)) \leq$

$\dim(F') \cdot (G : Z(G)C_1)$. Again,

$$\frac{\dim(\text{Sym}^{2k+1}(V))}{\dim(F')} = \frac{\binom{d+2k}{2k+1}}{\binom{a_1+2k-1}{2k} \cdot v_1} \geq \frac{\binom{d+6}{7}}{\binom{a_1+5}{6} \cdot v_1},$$

which is at least

$$\frac{(Ea_1 + v_1)^7/5040}{a_1^6 v_1/360} = E_1^6 \cdot \frac{1}{14} \cdot \frac{(1 + v_1/E_1 a_1)^7}{v_1/E_1 a_1} > E_1^6/2$$

if $a_1 \geq 21$ (since $(1 + v_1/E_1 a_1)^7 > 7v_1/E_1 a_1$). We have shown that if $a_1 \geq 21$, then

$$q^{6n-18} = E_1^6 < 2(G : Z(G)C_1) \leq \frac{2q^n(q^n + 1)(q^{n-1} - 1)(q^{n-2} + 1)(n, q + 1)}{q + 1}$$

which is impossible as $n \geq 9$. Thus $a_1 \leq 20$, which means that $\dim(V_\lambda) \leq 20E_1$ for all $\lambda \in \Omega^*(V)$. In this case, the (-1) -eigenspace for $1 \neq t \in Z$ on V has dimension $a_1(q/2)E_1 \leq 10q^{n-2}$. Notice that n conjugates of t generates L by [GS]. Hence $d \leq 10nq^{n-2}$ by [GT3, Lem. 3.2]. This in turn implies by [GMST, Thm. 2.7] that every composition factor of $V|_L$ is trivial or a Weil module. Since V is primitive, we conclude that $V|_L$ is in fact a Weil module.

3) Here we consider the case $n \geq 9$ and $m \leq 5$ and return to the notation $V_\lambda = E_\lambda \otimes A$, $E := \dim(E_\lambda) = \sqrt{|Q/Z|} = q^{n-2}$, $a := \dim(A)$, $v := \dim(V_\nu)$ for some $\nu \in \Omega(V) \setminus \{\lambda\}$, where Z is a long-root subgroup in L , $C := C_L(Z)$ and $Q := O_2(C)$.

First assume that $a \geq 4$. Then $\text{Sym}^4(V)|_C$ contains the submodules

$$\text{Sym}^4(E_\lambda \otimes A) \supset \wedge^4(E_\lambda) \otimes \wedge^4(A) \supset \wedge^4(A)$$

as E_λ is of type $-$ by Proposition 4.3. Hence if $m = 4$, then by Frobenius' reciprocity, $\dim(\text{Sym}^4(V)) \leq \dim(\wedge^4(A)) \cdot (G : Z(G)C)$. Furthermore,

$$\frac{\dim(\text{Sym}^4(V))}{\dim(\wedge^4(A))} = \binom{d+3}{4} / \binom{a}{4} > E^4.$$

Next we consider the case $m = 5$. Then $\text{Sym}^5(V)|_C$ contains the submodules $\text{Sym}^4(E_\lambda \otimes A) \otimes V_\nu \supset \wedge^4(A) \otimes V_\nu$. By Frobenius' reciprocity, $\dim(\text{Sym}^5(V)) \leq \dim(\wedge^4(A) \otimes V_\nu) \cdot (G : Z(G)C)$. Furthermore,

$$\frac{\dim(\text{Sym}^5(V))}{\dim(\wedge^4(A) \otimes V_\nu)} = \binom{d+4}{5} / \left(\binom{a}{4} \cdot v \right) > \frac{(Ea + v)^5/120}{a^4 v/24} = E^4 \cdot \frac{(1 + v/Ea)^5}{5v/Ea} > E^4.$$

It follows that in both cases,

$$q^{4n-8} = E^4 < (G : Z(G)C) \leq q(q^n + 1)(q^{n-1} - 1),$$

a contradiction since $n \geq 9$.

Thus $1 \leq a \leq 3$. Arguing as in 2), we conclude that $V|_L$ is in fact a Weil module.

4) Assume that $n = 7$ and $V|_L$ contains a non-Weil irreducible constituent. Then by [GMST, Thm. 2.7], $d \geq (q^7 + 1)(q^6 - q^2)/(q^2 - 1)(q + 1) - 1 > (5/3)q^9$, whereas $m(G) \leq 7q^{28}$, contradicting (3). As in 3), we can conclude that $V|_L$ is again a Weil module.

5) We have shown that $n \geq 7$ and $V|_L$ is a Weil module. Hence V_L lifts to a complex Weil module of L , with character $\zeta := \zeta_{n,q}^i$ for some i , $0 \leq i \leq q$. These characters, together with their branching to $M = SU_{n-1}(q)$, are described in [TZ2].

If $i = 0$, then $\zeta_{n,q}^0|_M$ contains $\alpha + \bar{\alpha}$, with $\alpha := \zeta_{n-1,q}^1$, whence

$$\text{Sym}^{2k}(\zeta)|_M \supset \text{Sym}^k(\alpha) \otimes \text{Sym}^k(\bar{\alpha}) \supset 1_M.$$

If in addition $q > 2$, then in fact $\zeta_{n,q}^0|_M$ contains $\alpha + \bar{\alpha} + \beta$, with $\beta := \zeta_{n-1,q}^2$, whence

$$\text{Sym}^{2k+1}(\zeta)|_M \supset \text{Sym}^k(\alpha) \otimes \text{Sym}^k(\bar{\alpha}) \otimes \beta \supset \beta.$$

If $i \neq 0$, then $\zeta_{n,q}^i|_M$ contains $\beta + \gamma$, with $\beta := \zeta_{n-1,q}^j$ for some $j \neq i, 0$, and $\gamma := \zeta_{n-1,q}^0$ is of type $+$, whence

$$\text{Sym}^{2k}(\zeta)|_M \supset \text{Sym}^{2k}(\gamma) \supset 1_M, \quad \text{Sym}^{2k+1}(\zeta)|_M \supset \text{Sym}^{2k}(\gamma) \otimes \beta \supset \beta.$$

It follows that $\text{Sym}^{2k}(V)$ has a composition factor of dimension $\leq (G : Z(G)M) \leq q^n(q^n + 1)(q + 1)$. If $k \geq 2$, then the latter is less than $\dim(\text{Sym}^{2k}(V))$ as $d \geq (q^n - q)/(q + 1)$, whence $\text{Sym}^{2k}(V)$ is reducible. So $m = 2k + 1 \geq 5$. In this case, if $(q, i) \neq (2, 0)$ then $\text{Sym}^{2k+1}(V)$ has a composition factor of dimension $\leq (G : Z(G)M)\beta(1) \leq q^{2n-1}(q^n + 1)$ which is again less than $\dim(\text{Sym}^{2k+1}(V))$, whence $\text{Sym}^{2k+1}(V)$ is reducible.

Finally, assume that $(q, i) = (2, 0)$. We aim to show that V lifts to a complex module, in which case $\text{Sym}^m(V)$ is reducible for every $m \geq 4$ by Corollary 2.19 as we have already shown that $\text{Sym}^4(V)$ is reducible. Since $V|_L$ affords the character $\hat{\zeta}$, by Lemma 2.11 it suffices to show that ζ extends to G . Here $L = S = PSU_n(2)$ as $\zeta_{n,q}^0$ is trivial at $Z(SU_n(q))$; also $Z(G)S = Z(G) \times S$. Next, ζ is the unique irreducible character of L of degree $(2^n - 2)/3$, so it is invariant under $\text{Aut}(S) = PGU_n(2) \cdot 2$. Since ζ is real-valued and L has odd index in $H := PGU_n(2)$, by [NT, Lem. 2.1], it has a unique real-valued extension $\tilde{\zeta}$ to H . Now $\tilde{\zeta}$ is the unique irreducible, real-valued, character of degree $(2^n - 2)/3$ of H , hence it is invariant under $H \cdot 2$. Observe that if $|G/(Z(G) \times S)| \leq 2$, then $\zeta \otimes 1_{Z(G)}$ is G -invariant and so it extends to G as required. In particular we are done if $(n, 3) = 1$ as in this case $H = S$. Assume $3|n$ and $|G/Z(G)S| > 2$; in particular $\zeta(1) = d$ is coprime to 3. By Proposition 2.14 we may replace G by its normalized version G_n and assume that $\det(\Phi(g)) = \pm 1$ for all $g \in G$, if Φ denotes the representation of G on V . But $(d, 3) = 1$ and Φ is faithful, so $O_3(Z(G)) = 1$. Let K be the complete inverse image of $H = S : 3$ in G ; in particular, $|G/K| \leq 2$. Since $O_3(Z(G)) = 1$, we see that $K \simeq Z(G) \times H$. Now $\tilde{\zeta} \otimes 1_{Z(G)}$ is an extension of ζ to K which is G -invariant, and so it extends to G as required. $\square$

Proposition 4.7. *Let $S \leq G/Z(G) \leq \text{Aut}(S)$ for the simple group $S = \text{PSp}_{2n}(q)$, with $n \geq 2$ and $q \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ is odd. Let V be a faithful irreducible $\mathbb{F}G$ -module in characteristic ℓ coprime to q and assume that an irreducible constituent of $V|_L$ is a Weil module. Then $X^k(V)$ is reducible for every $k \geq 4$ and $X \in \{\text{Sym}, \wedge\}$, except for $(n, q, X) = (2, 3, \wedge)$.*

Proof. Assume the contrary. The case $(n, q) = (2, 3)$ can be checked directly, so we will assume that $(n, q) \neq (2, 3)$. Now V is primitive, hence $V|_L$ is a Weil module of dimension $(q^n \pm 1)/2$. In particular, $V|_L$ lifts to a complex Weil module W . Notice that, since $q \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$, any field automorphism of L has odd order, and so it stabilizes each of the two complex Weil modules of dimension d . Since the character of V takes different values at the two L -classes of transvections, cf. [TZ2], and they are fused under the outer diagonal automorphism γ of L , we see that $G/Z(G)$ cannot induce γ . Thus $G/Z(G)S$ is cyclic and induces only field automorphisms of S . We conclude that W extends to a complex module of G . It follows by Lemma 2.11 that V lifts to a complex module which without loss we will denote also by V . So by Corollary 2.19 and Lemma 2.20, $X^4(V)$ must be irreducible. Consider a long-root subgroup Z in L and let $P := N_L(Z)$, $C := [P, P]$, $Q := O_p(P)$. Write $\dim(V) = (q^n + \epsilon)/2$ for some $\epsilon = \pm 1$. As we have shown, $(G : Z(G)L) \leq f$ if $q = p^f$ for a prime p . Notice that $V|_L = V_1 \oplus \sum_{\lambda \in \Omega^*(V)} E_\lambda$ and V_1 is actually a P/Q -module of dimension $(q^{n-1} + \epsilon)/2$.

1) First we consider the case $(q, 3) = 1$. We may identify $\Omega^*(V)$ with the subset $A := \{x^2 \mid x \in \mathbb{F}_q^\times\}$. Claim that there are $a, b \in A$ such that $a + b + 1 = 0$ and $(a, b) \neq (1, 1)$. Indeed, the two subsets $\{1 + x^2 \mid x \in \mathbb{F}_q\}$ and $\{-y^2 \mid y \in \mathbb{F}_q\}$ of $\mathbb{F}_q$ both have cardinality $(q + 1)/2$, hence they intersect, i.e. $1 + x^2 + y^2 = 0$ for some $x, y \in \mathbb{F}_q$. Since $q \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$, $xy \neq 0$, so $a := x^2 \in A$, $b := y^2 \in B$. Also, $(a, b) \neq (1, 1)$ as $(q, 3) = 1$. In the character language, this means that there are $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \Omega^*(V)$ such that $\alpha\beta\gamma = 1_Z$ and $\alpha \neq \beta$.

Assume $\gamma \notin \{\alpha, \beta\}$. Then $E_\alpha \otimes E_\beta \otimes E_\gamma$ affords the Q -character $q^{n-1}\rho_{Q/Z}$, where ρ_Y denotes the regular character of a finite group Y . In particular, the subspace F of Q -fixed points on $E_\alpha \otimes E_\beta \otimes E_\gamma$ has dimension q^{n-1} , and it is stabilized by C . Next assume that $\gamma = \beta$. Then $E_\alpha \otimes X^2(E_\beta)$ affords the Q -character $(q^{n-1} \pm 1)/2 \cdot \rho_{Q/Z}$. In particular, the subspace F of Q -fixed points on $E_\alpha \otimes X^2(E_\beta)$ has dimension $(q^{n-1} + 1)/2$, and it is stabilized by C . Notice that $X^4(V)|_C$ contains $E_\alpha \otimes E_\beta \otimes E_\gamma \otimes V_1$, resp. $E_\alpha \otimes X^2(E_\beta) \otimes V_1$. Thus we have shown that $X^4(V)|_C$ has a submodule $F \otimes V_1$ of dimension $\leq q^{n-1}(q^{n-1} + \epsilon)/2$. In fact, $F \otimes V_1$ is a C/Q -module, so a simple submodule of it extends to P , as $P/Q = (C/Q) \times \mathbb{Z}_{q-1}$. Hence by Frobenius' reciprocity,

$$\dim(X^4(V)) \leq \dim(F \otimes V_1) \cdot (G : Z(G)P) \leq \frac{q^{n-1}(q^{n-1} + \epsilon)(q^{2n} - 1)f}{2(q - 1)},$$

which is a contradiction since $n \geq 2$ and $p \geq 7$.

2) Next we consider the case $q = 3^f > 3$. Fix $\lambda \in \Omega^*(V)$. Since $Q/\text{Ker}(\lambda)$ has exponent 3, direct calculation shows that the subspace F of Q -fixed points on $X^3(E_\lambda)$ has dimension $(q^{n-1} \pm 1)/2$, and it is stabilized by C . As above, $X^4(V)|_C$ contains $X^3(E_\lambda) \otimes V_1$ and so it has a C -submodule $F \otimes V_1$, some simple submodule of which extends to P . Hence by Frobenius' reciprocity,

$$\dim(X^4(V)) \leq \dim(F \otimes V_1) \cdot (G : Z(G)P) \leq \frac{(q^{n-1} + 1)(q^{n-1} + \epsilon)(q^{2n} - 1)f}{4(q - 1)},$$

which is a contradiction since $n \geq 2$ and $q \geq 27$.

3) Now we may assume that $q = 3$ and $G = Sp_{2n}(3)$. Recall that G has four Weil characters, $\xi, \bar{\xi}$ of degree $(3^n + 1)/2$, and $\eta, \bar{\eta}$ of degree $(3^n - 1)/2$. By [MT1, Prop. 5.4], $\text{Sym}^2(\xi) = \text{Sym}^2(\bar{\xi})$, $\wedge^2(\eta) = \wedge^2(\bar{\eta})$, $\text{Sym}^2(\eta), \text{Sym}^2(\bar{\eta}), \wedge^2(\xi), \wedge^2(\bar{\xi}), \xi\eta = \bar{\xi}\bar{\eta}, \xi\bar{\eta} \neq \bar{\xi}\eta$ are all irreducible. Next,

$$1 = (\xi\eta, \bar{\xi}\bar{\eta}) = (\xi^2, \bar{\eta}^2) = (\text{Sym}^2(\xi) + \wedge^2(\xi), \text{Sym}^2(\bar{\eta}) + \wedge^2(\bar{\eta})),$$

whence $\wedge^2(\xi) = \text{Sym}^2(\bar{\eta})$. On the other hand, $0 = (\xi\bar{\eta}, \bar{\xi}\eta) = (\xi^2, \eta^2)$, so

$$\text{Sym}^2(\bar{\eta}) = \wedge^2(\xi) \neq \text{Sym}^2(\eta) = \wedge^2(\bar{\xi}).$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{Sym}^2(\xi) \otimes \xi, \bar{\xi}) &= (\text{Sym}^2(\xi), \text{Sym}^2(\bar{\xi}) + \wedge^2(\bar{\xi})) = 1, \\ (\wedge^2(\xi) \otimes \xi, \bar{\xi}) &= (\wedge^2(\xi), \text{Sym}^2(\bar{\xi}) + \wedge^2(\bar{\xi})) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that

$$\text{Sym}^2(\xi) \otimes \xi = \text{Sym}^3(\xi) + \mathbb{S}_{2,1}(\xi), \quad \wedge^2(\xi) \otimes \xi = \wedge^3(\xi) + \mathbb{S}_{2,1}(\xi),$$

where $\mathbb{S}_{2,1}$ is a Schur functor, cf. [FH]. Consequently, $\text{Sym}^3(\xi)$ contains $\bar{\xi}$ with multiplicity 1 and so it is reducible. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} (\wedge^2(\eta) \otimes \eta, \bar{\eta}) &= (\wedge^2(\eta), \wedge^2(\bar{\eta}) + \text{Sym}^2(\bar{\eta})) = 1, \\ (\text{Sym}^2(\eta) \otimes \eta, \bar{\eta}) &= (\text{Sym}^2(\eta), \wedge^2(\bar{\eta}) + \text{Sym}^2(\bar{\eta})) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

whence $\wedge^3(\eta)$ contains $\bar{\eta}$ with multiplicity 1 and so it is reducible.

4) Finally, we will use the Deligne-Lusztig theory, cf. [DM], to show that $\text{Sym}^4(\eta)$ and $\wedge^4(\xi)$ are reducible. If $n = 3$ then this can be verified using [Atlas]. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} D_1 &:= \dim(\text{Sym}^4(\eta)) = (3^{2n} - 1)(3^{n-1} + 1)(3^n + 5)/128, \\ D_2 &:= \dim(\wedge^4(\xi)) = (3^{2n} - 1)(3^{n-1} - 1)(3^n - 5)/128 \end{aligned}$$

are both coprime to 3, so it suffices to show that they are not equal to the degree of any semisimple character of G . If $n = 4$, then $43|D_1$ and $19|D_2$ but $(|G|, 43 \cdot 19) = 1$. If $n = 5$, then $31|D_1$ and $17|D_2$ but $(|G|, 31 \cdot 17) = 1$. If $n = 6$, then $367|D_1$ and $181|D_2$ but $(|G|, 367 \cdot 181) = 1$. So we may assume that $n \geq 7$.

Consider the dual group $G^* = SO_{2n+1}(3)$ and its natural module $N = \mathbb{F}_3^{2n+1}$. We need to show that there is no semisimple element $s \in G^*$ such that $E := (G^* :$

$C_{G^*}(s)_{3'}$ equals to D_1 or D_2 . Assume the contrary. For each $m \geq 3$, by [Zs] there is a prime ℓ_m that divides $3^m - 1$ but not $\prod_{i=1}^{m-1} (3^i - 1)$.

Claim that if $C := C_{G^*}(s)$ preserves any orthogonal decomposition $N = N^1 \perp N^2$ with $\dim(N^1) \geq \dim(N^2) \geq 1$ then $\dim(N^2) \leq 3$. Otherwise $\ell_{n-1}\ell_{2n-2}$ divides E , but $(\ell_{n-1}, D_1) = (\ell_{2n-2}, D_2) = 1$, a contradiction. Furthermore, if $\dim(N^2) = 3$, then E is divisible by $(3^{2n} - 1)(3^{n-1} \pm 1)/16$, whence $E \neq D_2$ as $3^n \not\equiv 5 \pmod{8}$.

5) Observe that the eigenspaces of s on $N \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_3} \overline{\mathbb{F}_3}$ gives rise to a C -invariant orthogonal decomposition $N = N_+ \perp N_1 \dots \perp N_t$, where $N_+ := \text{Ker}(s - 1)$ has odd dimension. Furthermore, if $1 \leq i \leq t$ then no eigenvalues of s on N_i are equal to 1, and $C_{GO(N_i)}(s) = GL_a(3^b)$ or $GU_a(3^b)$ with $\dim(N_i) = 2ab$ if $s + 1$ is non-degenerate on N_i . We label $\text{Ker}(s + 1)$ by N_t if it is nonzero. The above claim implies that one of the following two cases must occur.

Case 1: $t = 2$, $\dim(N_+) = 1$, $\{\dim(N_1), \dim(N_2)\} = \{2, 2n - 2\}$. Notice that $\dim(\text{Ker}(s + 1)) \leq 2n - 4$ as otherwise $C \geq SO_{2n-2}^\pm(3)$ and so E divides $(3^{2n} - 1)(3^{n-1} \pm 1)$, a contradiction. Hence if we label N_1 to have dimension $2n - 2$ then $s|_{N_1}$ is a semisimple element s_1 with no eigenvalue equal to ± 1 . Also by our claim in 4) (taking $N^2 = N_+ \oplus N_2$), we see that $E = D_1$, N_1 is of type $+$, and E_1 divides $(3^n + 5)/8$ and is at least $(3^n + 5)/128 > 2$, where $E_1 := (SO(N_1) : C_{SO(N_1)}(s_1))_{3'}$. Since $SO(N_1) = SO_{2n-2}^+(3)$ is self-dual, it follows that it has an irreducible character of degree E_1 , contradicting [TZ1].

Case 2: $t = 1$, and $\dim(N_+) = 1, 3, 2n - 1$. If $\dim(N_+) = 3$ then we can argue as in Case 1 to get a contradiction. If $\dim(N_+) = 2n - 1$, then $C \geq SO_{2n-1}(3)$ and so E divides $3^{2n} - 1$, a contradiction. Thus $\dim(N_+) = 1$, $\dim(N_1) = 2n$, $C = GU_a(3^b)$ or $GL_a(3^b)$ with $n = ab$. In the former case E is coprime to ℓ_{2n} , but ℓ_{2n} divides both D_1 and D_2 , a contradiction. In the latter case $E > 3^{n(n+1)/2} \geq 3^{4n} > \max\{D_1, D_2\}$, again a contradiction. $\square$

Remark 4.8. The identities $\text{Sym}^2(\xi) = \text{Sym}^2(\bar{\xi})$ and $\wedge^2(\eta) = \wedge^2(\bar{\eta})$ mentioned in the proof of Proposition 4.7 (there are similar examples with $Sp_{2n}(5)$ as well, cf. [MT1]), show that (irreducible) representations of finite quasisimple groups cannot be recovered from their symmetric square, resp. exterior square, as opposed to complex simple Lie groups, see [Ra2].

Lemma 4.9. *Let $S \leq G/Z(G) \leq \text{Aut}(S)$, where either $S = PSp_{2n}(q)$ with $n \geq 2$ and q is even, or $S \in \{F_4(q), {}^2F_4(q)'\}$ with $q = 2^f$, or $S = {}^2B_2(q)$ with $q = 2^f \geq 8$, or $S \in \{G_2(q), {}^2G_2(q)'\}$ with $q = 3^f$. Let V be a faithful irreducible $\mathbb{F}G$ -representation in characteristic ℓ coprime to q . Then $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ is reducible for every $k \geq 4$.*

Proof. Assume the contrary. Then we can apply (3) to G and V .

1) First we consider the case $S = PSp_{2n}(q)$. Notice that $d := \dim(V) \geq \mathfrak{d}(S) = (q^n - 1)(q^n - q)/2(q + 1)$, cf. [GT1], and $\mathfrak{m}(G) \leq q \prod_{i=1}^n (q^{2i} - 1)/(q - 1)^n$ as $|\text{Out}(S)| \leq q$. Hence (3) cannot hold for $2 \leq n \leq 5$ and $q \geq 4$. The cases $(n, q) = (2, 2), (3, 2)$, or $(4, 2)$ can be checked directly.

Assume $(n, q) = (5, 2)$; in particular $\text{Aut}(S) = S$ and so we may assume $G = S$. Then (3) implies that $d \leq 365$. By [GT1, Thm. 1.1], V is a unitary-Weil module. We restrict V to $P_1 = Q_1.Sp_8(2)$, the stabilizer of a 1-space in the natural module of G . Notice that any complex unitary-Weil character of G is real-valued, and by [GT1, Prop. 7.4] its restriction to P_1 contains some complex unitary-Weil character of $Sp_8(2)$ (which is of type $+$ by [Atlas]) with multiplicity 1. It follows that any complex unitary-Weil module of G is of type $+$. But V is a composition factor of multiplicity 1 in a complex unitary-Weil module, hence V is of type $+$, a contradiction by Lemma 2.13(i).

Thus we may assume $n \geq 6$. Since $\text{Mult}(S) = 1$, $S \triangleleft G$. Consider the subgroup $M = SO_{2n}^-(q)$ in S , its long-root subgroup Z and $C := C_M(Z) = Q.(SL_2(q) \times SO_{2n-4}^-(q))$. Then the assumptions of Proposition 4.3 hold for C , and moreover $\dim(V) > (5/2)\dim(E_\lambda)$ and $|\text{Out}(S)| \leq q/2$. Hence the proof of Proposition 4.3 implies that

$$q^{8n-16} < (9/2) \cdot (G : Z(G)C) \leq (9/8) \cdot q^{n+1}(q^{2n} - 1)(q^{2n-2} - 1)(q^{n-2} - 1)/(q^2 - 1),$$

a contradiction as $n \geq 6$.

2) Assume $S = F_4(q)$. If $q \geq 4$, then $d \geq \mathfrak{d}(S) = q^2(q^3 - 1)(q^6 - q^3 + q^2 - 1)/2$ by [T2], and $\mathfrak{m}(G) \leq q^{27}$ as $|\text{Out}(S)| \leq q$, contradicting (3). If $q = 2$, then (3) implies $d \leq 162$, whence $d = 52$ and $V|_L$ is of type $+$ by [HM], and so $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ is reducible. Assume $S = {}^2F_4(q)$ and $q \geq 8$. Then $d \geq \mathfrak{d}(S) = (q^4 + q^3 + q)(q - 1)\sqrt{q/2}$ by [T2], and $\mathfrak{m}(G) \leq q^{14}/2$ as $|\text{Out}(S)| \leq q/2$, contradicting (3). Assume $S = G_2(q)$ and $q \geq 9$. Then $d \geq \mathfrak{d}(S) = q^4 + q^2$, cf. [T2], and $\mathfrak{m}(G) < q^8$ as $|\text{Out}(S)| < q$, contrary to (3). Assume $S = {}^2G_2(q)$ and $q \geq 27$. Then $d \geq \mathfrak{d}(S) = q(q - 1)$ and $\mathfrak{m}(G) \leq q^{9/2}/9$ as $|\text{Out}(S)| \leq q/9$, contrary to (3). Assume $S = {}^2B_2(q)$ and $q \geq 32$. Then $d \geq \mathfrak{d}(S) = (q - 1)\sqrt{q/2}$ and $\mathfrak{m}(G) \leq q^{7/2}/2$ as $|\text{Out}(S)| < q/2$, contrary to (3). The cases $S = {}^2F_4(2)'$, $G_2(3)$, ${}^2G_2(3)'$, or ${}^2B_2(8)$ can be checked directly. $\square$

4.3. Generic cases. In view of the results of §4.2, we may now assume that $C_L(Z)$ satisfies the assumptions of Propositions 4.2 and 4.3 for a long-root subgroup Z of G . Assume that $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ is irreducible for some $k \geq 4$ and $d := \dim(V) > 4$. We will then apply (3) and Propositions 4.2 and 4.3 to G and V to get a contradiction.

Suppose that $S = PSL_n(q)$, $n \geq 3$. If $(n, q) = (3, 2)$, $(3, 3)$, $(4, 2)$, $(4, 3)$, or $(5, 2)$, then it is easy to check that $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ is reducible for $k \geq 4$. Assume $(n, q) = (3, 4)$. Then again it is easy to check that $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ is reducible for $k \geq 4$, except possibly when $d = 6$ and $L = 6 \cdot S$. In this case V lifts to a complex module $V_{\mathbb{C}}$, and $\text{Sym}^4(V_{\mathbb{C}})|_L$ contains irreducible constituents of dimensions 21 and 84, so $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ is reducible for $k \geq 4$. In all other cases, $d \geq \mathfrak{d}(S) \geq (q^n - q)/(q - 1) - 1$, and $\mathfrak{m}(G) \leq q^{(n^2+3)/2}$ as $|\text{Out}(S)| \leq q(q - 1)$. Hence (3) cannot hold for $n \leq 5$. Assume $n \geq 6$. In the notation of Proposition 4.3 we have $\dim(E_\lambda) = q^{n-2} < d/2$. Hence Propositions 4.2

and 4.3 imply

$$q^{4n-8} = (Q : Z)^2 < (15/2) \cdot (G : Z(G)C) \leq (15/2) \cdot (q^n - 1)(q^n - q),$$

a contradiction.

Suppose that $S = PSU_n(q)$, $n \geq 6$, $(n, q) \neq (6, 2)$, and q is odd if n is odd. Then

$$q^{4n-8} = (Q : Z)^2 < 24 \cdot (G : Z(G)C) \leq 24 \cdot (q^n - (-1)^n)(q^n + (-1)^n q),$$

a contradiction.

Suppose that $S = PSp_{2n}(q)$, $n \geq 2$, q is odd, $(n, q) \neq (2, 3), (2, 5)$ (and $q \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ if $V|_L$ involves a Weil module). Then

$$q^{4n-4} = (Q : Z)^2 < (3/2) \cdot (G : Z(G)C) \leq (3/4) \cdot (q^{2n} - 1)q,$$

a contradiction if $n \geq 3$. If $n = 2$, then $q \geq 7$, $d \geq \mathfrak{d}(S) \geq (q^2 - 1)/2$, and $\mathfrak{m}(G) \leq 4q(q^2 - 1)(q^4 - 1)/9(q - 1)^2$ as $|\text{Out}(S)| \leq 4q/9$, whence (3) cannot hold.

Suppose that $S = \Omega_{2n+1}(q)$, $n \geq 3$, q is odd, $(n, q) \neq (3, 3)$. Then

$$q^{8n-12} = (Q : Z)^2 < (3/2) \cdot (G : Z(G)C) \leq (3/2) \cdot (q^{2n} - 1)(q^{2n-2} - 1)q/(q^2 - 1),$$

a contradiction.

Suppose that $S = P\Omega_{2n}^\epsilon(q)$, $n \geq 4$, $(n, q) \neq (4, 2)$. Then $d \geq (q^n - 1)(q^{n-1} - q)/(q^2 - 1) > 2 \dim(E_\lambda)$ and $|\text{Out}(S)| \leq 12q$, whence

$$q^{8n-16} = (Q : Z)^2 < (15/2) \cdot (G : Z(G)C) \leq (15/2) \cdot \frac{(q^n - 1)(q^{2n-2} - 1)(q^{n-2} + 1)}{q^2 - 1} \cdot 12q,$$

a contradiction.

Suppose that $S = E_8(q)$. Then

$$q^{112} = (Q : Z)^2 < 24 \cdot (G : Z(G)C) \leq 12q \cdot \frac{(q^{20} - 1)(q^{24} - 1)(q^{30} - 1)}{(q^6 - 1)(q^{10} - 1)},$$

a contradiction. If $S = E_7(q)$, then

$$q^{64} = (Q : Z)^2 < 24 \cdot (G : Z(G)C) \leq 24q \cdot \frac{(q^{12} - 1)(q^{14} - 1)(q^{18} - 1)}{(q^4 - 1)(q^6 - 1)},$$

a contradiction. If $S = E_6(q)$, then

$$q^{40} = (Q : Z)^2 < 24 \cdot (G : Z(G)C) \leq 72q \cdot \frac{(q^8 - 1)(q^9 - 1)(q^{12} - 1)}{(q^3 - 1)(q^4 - 1)},$$

a contradiction. If $S = {}^2E_6(q)$ and $q > 2$, then

$$q^{40} = (Q : Z)^2 < 24 \cdot (G : Z(G)C) \leq 72q \cdot \frac{(q^8 - 1)(q^9 + 1)(q^{12} - 1)}{(q^3 + 1)(q^4 - 1)},$$

a contradiction. If $S = F_4(q)$ with q odd, then

$$q^{28} = (Q : Z)^2 < (3/2) \cdot (G : Z(G)C) \leq (3q/4) \cdot (q^4 + 1)(q^{12} - 1),$$

a contradiction. If $S = {}^3D_4(q)$ and $q > 2$, then

$$q^{16} = (Q : Z)^2 < 24 \cdot (G : Z(G)C) \leq 36q \cdot (q^8 + q^4 + 1)(q^2 - 1),$$

a contradiction. Assume $S = G_2(q)$ with $(q, 3) = 1$ and $q \geq 5$, then $d \geq q^3 - 1 > 2 \dim(E_\lambda)$, whence

$$q^8 = (Q : Z)^2 < (15/2) \cdot (G : Z(G)C) \leq (15/4) \cdot q(q^6 - 1),$$

again a contradiction.

The cases $S = PSp_4(3), PSp_4(5), \Omega_7(3), \Omega_8^\pm(2), {}^3D_4(2)$ can be handled easily using [Atlas] and [JLPW]. The case $S = G_2(4)$ leads to the example $d = 12, L = 2 \cdot S$; furthermore, if $\ell = 0$ then $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ is irreducible over L for $k \leq 4$ and $\text{Sym}^5(V)$ is irreducible over $L \cdot 2$. Finally, assume $S = {}^2E_6(2)$. Since $\mathfrak{m}(G) \leq (1.66) \cdot 10^{12}$ and $d \geq 1536$, $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ is reducible for $k \geq 5$; also $\text{Sym}^4(V)$ is reducible if $d \geq 2513$. Assume $d \leq 2512$. Observe that G contains a subgroup $H \in \{F_4(2), 2 \cdot F_4(2)\}$. The irreducible ℓ -modular Brauer characters of $2 \cdot F_4(2)$ are known [ModAt]. In particular, any such a character of degree ≤ 2512 is of type $+$. It follows by Lemma 2.15(i) that $d \leq 458$, a contradiction. This completes the proof of Theorem 4.1.

5. NORMALIZERS OF EXTRASPECIAL GROUPS

The aim of this section is to prove the following

Theorem 5.1. *Assume $\mathcal{G} := GL(V), Sp(V)$ or $GO(V)$, $G \leq \mathcal{G}$ is Zariski closed, $\dim(V) > 4$, and that the conclusion (iii) of Proposition 2.14 holds. Then, for $X \in \{\text{Sym}, \wedge\}$, $X^k(V)$ is reducible, if $k > 2$ and $p > 2$, or if $k > 3$ and $p = 2$, unless $(\dim(V), X) = (5, \wedge)$.*

Proof. Assume the contrary. Without loss we may replace G by $G_{\mathbf{n}}$. Recall that either $P = E$, or $p = 2$ and $P = \mathbb{Z}_4 * E$; furthermore, $d := \dim(V) = \sqrt{|E/Z(E)|} = p^n$. It is well known that the ℓ -modular representation $V|_P$ is liftable to a complex representation which extends to G . Hence by Lemma 2.11 we may assume that $\ell = 0$.

1) First we consider the case $p > 2$. Then we may assume $G = p_+^{1+2n} \cdot Sp_{2n}(p)$ which is a split extension. Assume $p = 3$. Direct computation shows that the fixed point subspace $\text{Sym}^3(V)^P$, resp. $\wedge^3(V)^P$, has dimension $(d+1)/2$, resp. $(d-1)/2$, whence $\text{Sym}^3(V)$ and $\wedge^3(V)$ are reducible. Now we may assume that $p \geq 5$ and consider the central involution j of $Sp_{2n}(p)$. It is well known that $V = V_+ \oplus V_-$, where j acts on V_δ as the scalar $\delta 1$ for $\delta = \pm$, and $\{\dim(V_+), \dim(V_-)\} = \{a, a+1\}$ with $a = (d-1)/2$. Set $\epsilon := 1$ if $X = \text{Sym}$ and $\epsilon := -1$ if $X = \wedge$. By Corollary 2.19 and Lemma 2.20, $X^3(V)$ is irreducible, and it affords the $Z(P)$ -character $d(d+\epsilon)(d+2\epsilon)/6 \cdot \lambda^3$, if $V|_{Z(P)}$ affords the character $d\lambda$. Let V_3 denote the unique complex P -representation with $Z(P)$ -character $d\lambda^3$. Notice that V_3 extends to G and, by Clifford theory, $X^3(V) = V_3 \otimes A$ for some (irreducible) G/P -module A of dimension $(d+\epsilon)(d+2\epsilon)/6$. If $n = 1$ and $(d, X) \neq (5, \wedge), (7, \wedge)$, then $d = p \geq 5$ and $\dim(C) > p+1 = \mathfrak{m}(G/P)$,

whence $X^3(V)$ is reducible. If $(d, X) = (7, \wedge)$, then $\dim(C) = 5$ does not divide $|G|$ and so $X^3(V)$ is again reducible. So we may assume $n \geq 2$. Now j acts scalarly on A , whence the difference D between the dimensions of the 1-eigenspace and the (-1) -eigenspace of j on $X^3(V)$ must be divisible by $\dim(A)$. On the other hand, since the 1-eigenspace of j on $X^3(V)$ is just $X^3(V_+) \oplus V_+ \otimes X^2(V_-)$, we see that $|D| = a + 1$ if $X = \text{Sym}$ and $|D| = a$ if $X = \wedge$, a contradiction. Observe that $(V \otimes V^*)/1_G$ is irreducible, therefore both $\text{Sym}^2(V)$ and $\wedge^2(V)$ are irreducible over $G = p_+^{1+2n} \cdot Sp_{2n}(p)$, cf. [GT2].

2) Now we consider the case $p = 2$. Then $E = 2_\epsilon^{1+2n} \leq P \leq \mathbb{Z}_4 * E$ for some $\epsilon = \pm$. Direct computation shows that the fixed point subspace $\text{Sym}^4(V)^P$, resp. $\wedge^4(V)^P$, has dimension $(d+1)(d+2)/6$, resp. $(d-1)(d-2)/6$, whence $\text{Sym}^4(V)$ and $\wedge^4(V)$ are reducible. Observe however that $\text{Sym}^3(V)$ and $\wedge^3(V)$ are irreducible over $N_G(E)$ by [GT2]. $\square$

6. ALTERNATING GROUPS, SYMMETRIC GROUPS, AND THEIR COVERS

This section is devoted to the proof of the following theorem

Theorem 6.1. *Theorem 1.1 holds true in the case G is finite and $S := \text{soc}(G/Z(G))$ is the alternating group A_n for some $n \geq 5$.*

We begin with considering the case $n \geq 8$. Then the representation Φ of G on V yields a projective representation of $G/Z(G) = A_n$ or S_n . It follows that $Z(GL(V))G = Z(GL(V))\Psi(H)$, where $H = \hat{A}_n$, resp. $\tilde{S}_n$ (the double cover of S_n in which transpositions lift to elements of order 4), and $\Psi : H \rightarrow GL(V)$ is an irreducible representation. Ignoring the faithfulness of G acting on V , we may therefore assume that $G \in \{\hat{A}_n, \tilde{S}_n\}$. In view of Lemma 2.1 we will assume that $\text{char}(\mathbb{F}) = \ell > 3$. Whenever we consider a subgroup $\hat{A}_m$ or $\tilde{S}_m$ of $\hat{A}_n$ or $\tilde{S}_n$, we will mean a standard one, that is the one fixing $1, 2, \dots, n-m$ in the natural permutation representation of S_n . Also by a sum of simple modules we mean the sum in the Grothendieck group. We will also fix a preimage $\mathfrak{t}$ of order 3 in $\hat{A}_n$ of a 3-cycle.

We begin with the following observations:

Lemma 6.2. (i) *Every element of $\hat{A}_n$ is rational in $\tilde{S}_n$.*

(ii) *Assume $\varphi \in \text{IBr}_\ell(\tilde{S}_n)$ and $\varphi|_{\hat{A}_n}$ is reducible. Then φ is rational-valued.*

(iii) *Assume $\varphi \in \text{IBr}_\ell(\hat{A}_n)$ and φ extends to $\tilde{S}_n$. Then φ is rational-valued.*

Proof. (i) Let $\pi : \tilde{S}_n \rightarrow S_n$ be the natural projection and $g \in \hat{A}_n$. Clearly, g is rational in $\tilde{S}_n$ if $\pi^{-1}(\pi(g)^{S_n})$ is a single $\tilde{S}_n$ -conjugacy class. Otherwise by [HH, Thm. 3.8] $\pi(g)$ is a product of disjoint cycles of odd lengths. In particular, $\pi(g)$ has odd order k . It follows that $g^k = z^i$ and $(zg)^k = z^{1+i}$ for some $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $Z(A_n) = \langle z \rangle$. Replacing g by zg if necessary, we may assume that $i = 0$ and so $|g| = k$, $|zg| = 2k$.

In this case, $\pi^{-1}(\pi(g)^{\tilde{S}_n}) = g^{\tilde{S}_n} \cup (zg)^{\tilde{S}_n}$. Hence, all generators of $\langle g \rangle$ belong to $g^{\tilde{S}_n}$ and so g is rational, in which case zg is also rational.

(ii) By assumptions, $\varphi = \text{Ind}_{\hat{A}_n}^{\tilde{S}_n}(\psi)$ for some $\psi \in \text{IBr}_\ell(\hat{A}_n)$, whence $\varphi = 0$ on $\tilde{S}_n \setminus \hat{A}_n$. On the other hand, $\varphi|_{\hat{A}_n}$ is rational by (i).

(iii) follows from (i). $\square$

Among all the irreducible representations of G , the *basic spin* and *second basic spin* representations, cf. [Wa] and [KT], will require special attention. For a fixed ℓ , define κ_n to be 1 if $0 < \ell|n$ and 0 otherwise. Then the (ℓ -modular) basic spin modules of $\hat{A}_n$, resp. of $\tilde{S}_n$, have dimension $D_n^1 := 2^{\lfloor (n-2-\kappa_n)/2 \rfloor}$, resp. $D_n^2 := 2^{\lfloor (n-1-\kappa_n)/2 \rfloor}$. The second basic spin modules of $\tilde{S}_n$ have dimension at least $2^{(n-3)/2}(n-4)$ unless $2|n$ and $\ell|(n-1)$ in which case they have dimension $2^{(n-4)/2}(n-4)$. Let D_n^3 denote the smallest one among the dimensions of second basic spin representations of $\tilde{S}_n$ and $\tilde{S}_{n-1}$. Then

$$(4) \quad D_n^3 \geq \max\{(n-5) \cdot D_{n-2}^1, (n-5)/2 \cdot D_{n-2}^2\}.$$

Basic spin modules are distinguished by the following property:

Lemma 6.3. [Wa, Thm. 8.1] *Let V be an irreducible $\mathbb{F}$ -representation of $G \in \{\hat{A}_n, \tilde{S}_n\}$ such that the action of $\mathfrak{t}$ (a 3rd order preimage in G of a 3-cycle) on V has a quadratic minimal polynomial. Then V is a basic spin module. $\square$*

Lemma 6.4. *Let $G \in \{\hat{A}_n, \tilde{S}_n\}$ and let V be an irreducible $\mathbb{F}G$ -module which is not a basic spin module.*

(i) *Assume $G = \hat{A}_n$ and $\text{soc}(V|_{\hat{A}_{n-2}})$ contains a basic spin module of $\hat{A}_{n-2}$. Then $\dim(V) \geq D_n^3/2 \geq D_{n-2}^1 \cdot (n-5)/2$.*

(ii) *Assume $G = \tilde{S}_n$ and $\text{soc}(V|_{\tilde{S}_{n-2}})$ contains a basic spin module of $\tilde{S}_{n-2}$. Then $\dim(V) \geq D_n^3 \geq D_{n-2}^2 \cdot (n-5)/2$.*

Proof. (i) Let $W \in \text{IBr}_\ell(\tilde{S}_n)$ such that V is a submodule of $W|_{\hat{A}_n}$. Then we can choose $x \in C_{\tilde{S}_n}(\hat{A}_{n-2})$ such that $W|_{\hat{A}_n} = V$ or $W|_{\hat{A}_n} = V \oplus xV$. By assumptions, $W|_{\hat{A}_{n-2}}$ contains a basic spin module U , whence W is a quotient of $\text{Ind}_{\tilde{S}_{n-2}}^{\tilde{S}_n}(\text{Ind}_{\hat{A}_{n-2}}^{\tilde{S}_{n-2}}(U))$. Since $\text{Ind}_{\hat{A}_{n-2}}^{\tilde{S}_{n-2}}(U)$ is a sum of basic spin modules of $\tilde{S}_{n-2}$, there is a basic spin module Y_{n-2} of $\tilde{S}_{n-2}$ such that W is a quotient of $\text{Ind}_{\tilde{S}_{n-2}}^{\tilde{S}_n}(Y_{n-2})$. Next, by [Wa] $\text{Ind}_{\tilde{S}_{n-2}}^{\tilde{S}_{n-1}}(Y_{n-2})$ is a sum of basic and second basic spin modules of $\tilde{S}_{n-1}$. It follows that W is a quotient of $\text{Ind}_{\tilde{S}_{n-1}}^{\tilde{S}_n}(X)$, where either X is a basic spin module Y_{n-1} of $\tilde{S}_{n-1}$, or a second basic spin module T_{n-1} of $\tilde{S}_{n-1}$. In the former case, W must be a second basic spin module of $\tilde{S}_n$ (as V is not basic), whence $\dim(W) \geq D_n^3$. In the latter case, $\text{soc}(W|_{\tilde{S}_{n-1}})$

contains a second basic spin module of $\tilde{S}_{n-1}$, hence $\dim(W) \geq D_n^3$ again. So we are done by (4).

(ii) can be proved similarly. $\square$

Corollary 6.5. *Let $G \in \{\hat{A}_n, \tilde{S}_n\}$ and let V be an irreducible $\mathbb{F}G$ -module which is not a basic spin module. Assume $\text{soc}(V|_{\hat{A}_{n-2}})$ contains a basic spin module of $\hat{A}_{n-2}$. Then $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ is reducible for any $k \geq 3$ if $n \geq 20$, and for any $k \geq 4$ if $n \geq 13$.*

Proof. Assume the contrary. Define $H := \hat{A}_{n-2}$ if $G = \hat{A}_n$, and $H := \tilde{S}_{n-2}$ if $G = \tilde{S}_n$. By assumptions, $\text{soc}(V|_H)$ contains a basic spin module U of H , whence $\text{soc}(\text{Sym}^k(V)|_H)$ contains $\text{Sym}^k(U)$. By Frobenius' reciprocity, $\dim(\text{Sym}^k(V)) \leq \dim(\text{Sym}^k(U)) \cdot (G : H)$. Since $(G : H) = n(n-1)$ and $\dim(V) \geq e(n-5)/2$ for $e := \dim(U)$ by Lemma 6.4, this implies $n(n-1) \geq \binom{e(n-5)/2 + k - 1}{k} / \binom{e + k - 1}{k}$. The last inequality cannot hold if $n \geq 20$ and $k \geq 3$, or if $n \geq 13$ and $k \geq 4$, since $e \geq D_{n-2}^1 = 2^{\lfloor (n-5)/2 \rfloor}$. $\square$

Proposition 6.6. *Let $G \in \{\hat{A}_n, \tilde{S}_n\}$ and let V be an irreducible $\mathbb{F}G$ -module of dimension $d > 1$. If m is odd or if $(G, \ell) = (\hat{A}_{14}, 7)$, assume in addition that V is not a basic spin module. Then $\text{Sym}^m(V)$ is reducible, if $m \geq 3$ and $n \geq 23$, or if $m \geq 4$ and $n \geq 14$.*

Proof. 1) Assume the contrary. Write $V = V_0 \oplus V_1 \oplus V_2$, where $\mathfrak{t}$ acts on V_j as the scalar ω^j , ω a primitive cubic root of unity in $\mathbb{F}$, and $V_1, V_2 \neq 0$. By Lemma 6.3, $V_0 \neq 0$ if V is not basic. We give the proof for the case of $m \geq 4$, the case with $m = 3$ is proceeded similarly.

Case 1: Assume $G = \tilde{S}_n$ and $V|_{\hat{A}_n}$ is reducible. Then V is self-dual by Lemma 6.2. Setting $C := C_G(\mathfrak{t})$, we see that $V_2 \simeq V_1^*$ as C -modules. Clearly, $\text{Sym}^{2k}(V)|_C \supset \text{Sym}^k(V_1) \otimes \text{Sym}^k(V_2) \supset 1_C$, and $\text{Sym}^{2k+1}(V)|_C \supset V_0 \otimes \text{Sym}^k(V_1) \otimes \text{Sym}^k(V_2) \supset V_0$. By Frobenius' reciprocity, if $m = 2k \geq 4$ then $\dim(\text{Sym}^4(V)) \leq \dim(\text{Sym}^m(V)) \leq (G : C)$. If $m = 2k + 1 \geq 5$ then $\dim(\text{Sym}^5(V)) \leq \dim(\text{Sym}^m(V)) \leq (G : C) \cdot \dim(V_0)$. In either case we obtain $(d+1)(d+2)(d+3)(d+4) \leq 120(G : C) = 40n(n-1)(n-2)$.

Case 2: Assume that either $G = \tilde{S}_n$ and $V|_{\hat{A}_n}$ is irreducible, or $G = \hat{A}_n$ and V extends to $\tilde{S}_n$. In either case, $V|_{\hat{A}_n}$ is irreducible and self-dual by Lemma 6.2. So we can set $C := C_{\hat{A}_n}(\mathfrak{t})$ and repeat the above argument to get $(d+1)(d+2)(d+3)(d+4) \leq 120(G : C) \leq 80n(n-1)(n-2)$.

Case 3: Assume that $G = \hat{A}_n$ and V does not extend to $\tilde{S}_n$. In this case, we can embed $H := \tilde{S}_{n-2}$ in G (as the inverse image in G of a subgroup of index 2 in $S_{n-2} \times S_2$ that contains $\mathfrak{t}$). Consider a simple submodule U of smallest dimension of $V|_H$.

Assume $\dim(U) = 1$. Setting $C := H' = \hat{A}_{n-2}$, we see that $U|_C = 1_C$, whence $\text{Sym}^m(V)|_C \supset \text{Sym}^m(1_C) = 1_C$, and so $d(d+1)(d+2)(d+3) \leq 2(G : C) = 2n(n-1)$.

Now we may assume that $\dim(U) > 1$. Again write $U = U_0 \oplus U_1 \oplus U_2$, where $\mathfrak{t}$ acts on U_j as the scalar ω^j , and $U_1, U_2 \neq 0$. If $U|_{H'}$ is reducible, then U is self-dual by Lemma 6.2, whence $U_2 \simeq U_1^*$ as modules over $C := C_H(\mathfrak{t})$; set $N := N_H(\langle \mathfrak{t} \rangle)$ in this case. If $U|_{H'}$ is irreducible, then $U|_{H'}$ is self-dual by Lemma 6.2, whence $U_2 \simeq U_1^*$ as modules over $C := C_{H'}(\mathfrak{t})$; set $N := N_{H'}(\langle \mathfrak{t} \rangle)$ in this case. Now if $m = 2k \geq 4$, then as in Case 1 we see that $\text{Sym}^m(V)|_C$ contains 1_C . The proof of Lemma 2.12 shows that $\text{Sym}^m(V)|_N$ contains a submodule of dimension 1, so $\dim(\text{Sym}^4(V)) \leq (G : N)$. Assume $m = 2k + 1 \geq 5$. By Corollary 6.5 we may assume that $\text{soc}(V|_{\hat{A}_{n-2}})$ does not contain a basic spin module of $\hat{A}_{n-2}$, so $U_0 \neq 0$ by Lemma 6.3. Now $\text{Sym}^{2k+1}(V)|_C$ contains a submodule $F \simeq U_0$ inside $U_0 \otimes \text{Sym}^k(U_1) \otimes \text{Sym}^k(U_2)$. Since U_0 is N -invariant, by Lemma 2.12 $\text{Sym}^{2k+1}(V)|_C$ contains a submodule of dimension $\leq \dim(U_0)$. It follows that $\dim(\text{Sym}^5(V)) \leq (G : N) \cdot \dim(U_0)$. In either case, we obtain $(d+1)(d+2)(d+3)(d+4) \leq 120(G : N) \leq 20n(n-1)(n-2)(n-3)(n-4)$.

2) We have shown that in all cases

$$(d+1)(d+2)(d+3)(d+4) \leq 20n(n-1)(n-2)(n-3)(n-4).$$

Assume that V is faithful. Then $d \geq 2^{\lfloor (n-2-\kappa_n)/2 \rfloor}$ by [KT], so we get a contradiction if $n \geq 15$, or if $n = 14$ but $(G, \ell) \neq (\hat{A}_{14}, \ell)$. Now assume that V is not faithful and that $V|_{\hat{A}_n}$ is not the heart $\mathcal{D}$ of the natural permutation module. Then $d \geq (n^2 - 5n + 2)/2$ by [GT3, Lem. 6.1] and its proof, so we again get a contradiction when $n \geq 14$. Thus $V|_{\hat{A}_n} \simeq \mathcal{D}$. Since $\mathcal{D}$ is of type $+$, $\text{Sym}^m(V)$ is reducible by Lemma 2.13. $\square$

Lemma 6.7. *Let $G \in \{\hat{A}_n, \tilde{S}_n\}$ with $n \geq 12$ and let V be a complex basic spin G -module. Then $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ is reducible for all $k \geq 2$, and $\wedge^k(V)$ is reducible for all $2 \leq k \leq d/2$.*

Proof. It suffices to prove the statement for $k = 2$. Recall, cf. [T1], that if m is even then $\hat{A}_m$ has a unique basic spin character α_m which is real-valued, whereas if m is odd then $\hat{A}_m$ has two basic spin characters which are real-valued if and only if $m \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$. Choose $m = n$ if $2|n$ or if $n \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$, and $m = n - 1$ if $n \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$, and let $H := \hat{A}_{m-2}$. Let α_m be an irreducible character afforded by the $\hat{A}_m$ -module V ; in particular, α_m is real-valued. All irreducible constituents of $\alpha_m|_H$ are of degree $\alpha(1)/2$ and are basic. If m is even, then the uniqueness of α_{m-2} implies that $\alpha_m|_H = 2\alpha_{m-2}$. If m is odd, then $m - 2 \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ and so the basic spin characters of H are not real-valued, whence $\alpha_m|_H = \alpha_{m-2} + \bar{\alpha}_{m-2}$. We have shown that $V|_H$ contains $U \oplus U^*$ for some H -module U .

Now assume that $X(V)$ is irreducible for some $X \in \{\text{Sym}^2, \wedge^2\}$. Clearly, $X(V)|_H$ contains $U \otimes U^* \supset 1_H$ and so $\dim(X(V)) \leq (G : H)$; in particular, $d(d-1) \leq 4n(n-1)(n-2)$. The last inequality cannot hold for $n \geq 18$ as $d \geq 2^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - 1}$. If $n \in \{12, 13, 14, 16, 17\}$ then $(G : H) \leq 2n(n-1)$ as $m = n$, again yielding a contradiction. If $n = 15$ and $G = \tilde{S}_n$ then $d = 2^7$, leading to a contradiction. Finally,

assume $G = \hat{A}_{15}$, so $H = \hat{A}_{12}$. We have shown that $X(V)|_H$ contains 1_H . On the other hand, $G > K := \hat{A}_{12} \times \mathbb{Z}_3$. Hence $X(V)|_K$ contains a 1-dimensional submodule and so $\dim(X(V)) \leq (G : K)$, yielding a contradiction. $\square$

Notice that $\wedge^2(V)$ is irreducible for a complex spin module V of $\hat{A}_{11}$.

Proposition 6.8. *Let $G \in \{\hat{A}_n, \tilde{S}_n\}$ and let V be an ℓ -modular basic spin G -module. Then $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ is reducible if $k \geq 2$ and $n \geq 16$, or if $k \geq 4$ and $n \geq 14$.*

Proof. Assume the contrary. By Lemma 6.7, V cannot lift to a complex module. It follows by [KT] that $\ell|n$, and either $G = \tilde{S}_n$ and n is odd, or $G = \hat{A}_n$ and n is even.

1) Here we assume that $G = \tilde{S}_n$ and n is odd; in particular, $d = 2^{(n-3)/2}$. Hence $V|_{\hat{A}_n}$ is irreducible, self-dual by Lemma 6.2, and lifts to a complex module W . Clearly, $\text{Sym}^k(V)|_{\hat{A}_n}$ is a sum of at most two irreducible constituents, all of the same degree. The same must be true also for $\text{Sym}^k(W)$.

Case 1: Assume $n \equiv 3 \pmod{8}$. By [T1, p. 106], $V|_{\hat{A}_n}$ is of type +, whence $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ is reducible if $n \geq 11$ by Lemma 2.13.

Case 2: Assume $n \equiv 1 \pmod{8}$ and $n \geq 17$. Then W is of type +, cf. [T1], and so is $V|_{\hat{A}_n}$, so we can argue as in Case 1.

Case 3: Assume $n \equiv 7 \pmod{8}$ and $n \geq 15$. Consider a subgroup $H = \hat{A}_{n-5}$. By [T1], any simple submodule U of $W|_H$ is basic spin, real, and of dimension $d/4$. Thus $\text{Sym}^k(W)|_H$ contains U if $k \geq 3$ is odd, resp. 1_H if k is even. Consider $K = H * \hat{A}_5$ inside $\hat{A}_n$. Since $K/H = A_5$ and $\mathfrak{m}(\hat{A}_5) = 6$, by Lemma 2.12 $\text{Sym}^k(W)|_K$ has a submodule T of dimension $\leq 6 \dim(U) = 3d/2$, resp. ≤ 6 . Thus $\text{Sym}^k(W)$ has a subquotient of dimension at most $\dim(T)(\hat{A}_n : K) = \dim(T)(G : K)/2$. Since $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ is irreducible, $\dim(\text{Sym}^k(V))$ is at most $\dim(T)(G : K)$, which is $3d/2 \cdot (G : K)$, resp. $6(G : K)$. In particular, $2^{n-3} < 2n(n-1)(n-2)(n-3)(n-4)/5$, a contradiction if $n \geq 31$. The upper bound on $\dim(\text{Sym}^k(V))$ also gives a contradiction if $n = 15, 23$ and $k \geq 4$. Assume $n = 23$ and $k = 2, 3$. Then 41 divides $\dim(\text{Sym}^k(W))$ but not $|\hat{A}_n|$, hence $\text{Sym}^k(W)$ cannot be a sum of 1 or 2 irreducible constituents of the same degree.

Case 4: Assume $n \equiv 5 \pmod{8}$ and $n \geq 21$. Consider a subgroup $H = \hat{A}_{n-3}$. By [T1], any simple submodule U of $W|_H$ is basic spin, real, and of dimension $d/2$. Thus $\text{Sym}^k(W)|_H$ contains U , resp. 1_H , if $k \geq 3$ is odd, resp. if k is even. Consider $K = H \times \mathbb{Z}_3$ inside $\hat{A}_n$. By Lemma 2.12 $\text{Sym}^k(V)|_K$ has a submodule of dimension $\leq \dim(U) = d/2$, resp. ≤ 1 . Thus $\dim(\text{Sym}^k(V))$ is at most $d/2 \cdot (G : K)$, resp. $(G : K)$. In particular, $2^{n-3} < 2n(n-1)(n-2)$, a contradiction as $n \geq 21$.

2) Here we assume that $G = \hat{A}_n$ and n is even; in particular, $d = 2^{(n-4)/2}$. Hence $V|_{\hat{A}_{n-1}}$ is irreducible and lifts to a complex module W .

Case 5: Assume $n \equiv 0 \pmod{8}$. Since $2 < \ell|n$, we may assume that $n \geq 24$. First we assume that $\ell \geq 5$; in particular $n \geq 40$. Consider a subgroup $H = \hat{A}_{n-6}$. By [T1], any irreducible constituent of $W|_H$ is basic spin, real, irreducible modulo ℓ (as $(\ell, n-6) = 1$) and of dimension $d/4$. It follows that $V|_H$ contains a simple submodule U of type $+$ and dimension $d/4$. Hence $\text{Sym}^k(V)|_H$ contains U if $k \geq 3$ is odd, resp. 1_H if k is even. Consider $K = H * \hat{A}_6$ inside G . Since $K/H = A_6$ and $\mathfrak{m}(6A_6) = 15$, by Lemma 2.12 $\text{Sym}^k(V)|_K$ has a submodule of dimension $\leq 15 \dim(U) = 15d/4$, resp. ≤ 15 . Thus $\dim(\text{Sym}^k(V))$ is at most $15d/4 \cdot (G : K)$, resp. $15(G : K)$. In particular, $2^{n-4} < n(n-1)(n-2)(n-3)(n-4)(n-5)/12$, a contradiction as $n \geq 40$.

Now we assume that $\ell = 3$ and consider a subgroup $H = \hat{A}_{n-5}$. Notice that $\hat{A}_{n-1}$ contains an overgroup $H_1 \simeq \hat{S}_{n-5}$ of H . If Φ denotes the representation of G on V , set $H_2 := \langle \Phi(x), \sqrt{-1}\Phi(y) \mid x \in H, y \in H_1 \setminus H \rangle$. Then H_2 is a subgroup of $GL(V)$ that is isomorphic to $\hat{S}_{n-5}$. In the same way we can make H_2 act on W . By [T1], any irreducible constituent of $W|_{H_2}$ is basic spin, real, irreducible modulo ℓ (as $(\ell, n-5) = 1$) and of dimension $d/2$. It follows that $V|_{H_2}$ contains a simple submodule U_2 of type $+$ and dimension $d/2$. Hence, if $k \geq 3$ is odd then $\text{Sym}^k(V)|_{H_2}$ contains U_2 , and so $\text{Sym}^k(V)|_H$ contains a basic spin module U of H of dimension $d/4$. If k is even, then $\text{Sym}^k(V)|_{H_2}$ contains 1_{H_2} , and so $\text{Sym}^k(V)|_H$ contains 1_H . Consider $K = H * \hat{A}_5$ inside G . Since $K/H = A_5$ and $\mathfrak{m}(\hat{A}_5) = 10$, by Lemma 2.12 $\text{Sym}^k(V)|_K$ has a submodule of dimension $\leq 6 \dim(U) = 3d/2$ if k is odd, resp. ≤ 6 if k is even. Thus $\dim(\text{Sym}^k(V))$ is at most $3d/2 \cdot (G : K)$, resp. $6(G : K)$. In particular, $2^{n-4} < n(n-1)(n-2)(n-3)(n-4)/5$, a contradiction as $n \geq 24$.

Case 6: Assume $n \equiv 6 \pmod{8}$ and $n \geq 14$. Consider a subgroup $H = \hat{A}_{n-4}$. By [T1], any irreducible constituent of $W|_H$ is basic spin, real, irreducible modulo ℓ (as $(\ell, n-4) = 1$) and of dimension $d/2$. It follows that $V|_H$ contains a simple submodule U of type $+$ and dimension $d/2$. Hence $\text{Sym}^k(V)|_H$ contains U if $k \geq 3$ is odd, resp. 1_H if k is even. Consider $K = H * \hat{A}_3$ inside G . By Lemma 2.12 $\text{Sym}^k(V)|_K$ has a submodule of dimension $\leq \dim(U) = d/2$, resp. ≤ 1 . Thus $\dim(\text{Sym}^k(V))$ is at most $d/2 \cdot (G : K)$, resp. $(G : K)$. In particular, $2^{n-4} < n(n-1)(n-2)(n-3)$, a contradiction if $n \geq 22$. If $n = 14$ and $k \geq 4$, then the upper bound on $\dim(\text{Sym}^k(V))$ yields $2^{2n-8} < 20n(n-1)(n-2)(n-3)$, again a contradiction.

Case 7: Assume $n \equiv 2, 4 \pmod{8}$ and $n \geq 18$. Consider a subgroup $H = \hat{A}_{n-2}$. By [T1], $W|_H$ is basic spin, real, irreducible modulo ℓ (as $(\ell, n-2) = 1$). It follows that $V|_H$ is of type $+$. Hence $\text{Sym}^k(V)|_H$ contains $V|_H$ if $k \geq 3$ is odd, resp. 1_H if k is even. Thus $\dim(\text{Sym}^k(V))$ is at most $d(G : H)$, resp. $(G : H)$. In particular, $2^{n-4} < 6n(n-1)$, a contradiction as $n \geq 18$. $\square$

The proof of Theorem 6.1 is now completed by the following lemma:

Lemma 6.9. *Assume $S = \text{soc}(G/Z(G)) = \mathbf{A}_n$ with $5 \leq n \leq 13$, $G < GL(V)$, $\ell \neq 2, 3$, and $d > 4$.*

(i) *If $5 \leq n \leq 10$ then $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ is reducible for $k \geq 4$.*

(ii) *Assume $11 \leq n \leq 13$. Then $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ is reducible for $k \geq 4$. Furthermore, either $\wedge^k(V)$ is reducible for $k \geq 4$, or $G^{(\infty)} = \mathbf{A}_n$ and $V|_{\mathbf{A}_n} \simeq \mathcal{D}$, the heart of the natural permutation module.*

Proof. (i) follows by inspecting [Atlas] and [JLPW]. Assume (ii) is false. We need to look at the modules V with $\dim(\wedge^4(V)) \leq \mathbf{m}(\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_n)$. We give the details of the computation for $n = 13$. Here $\mathbf{m}(\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_n) = 41600$, so $d \leq 33$. It follows that $d = 32$ and either V lifts to a complex basic spin module, or $(G, \ell) = (\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_{13}, 13)$. In the former case we are done by Lemma 6.7. The latter case can be checked directly using [Atlas] and [JLPW]. $\square$

7. SPORADIC GROUPS

In this section we prove the following theorem:

Theorem 7.1. *Theorem 1.1 holds true in the case G is finite and $S := \text{soc}(G/Z(G))$ is a sporadic simple group.*

Proof. Obviously, we need to consider only the cases where

$$(5) \quad \dim(\wedge^3(V)) < \mathbf{m}(G) .$$

For brevity, we take the convention that the condition $k \geq k_0$ for $\wedge^k(V)$ will actually mean that $k_0 \leq k \leq d - k_0$. In fact, we will also work with $\wedge^k(V)$ and we assume that $\ell > 3$. The detailed results are listed in Table I (below), where in the third column we list the values (k_1, d_1) such that k_1 is the (known) highest possible $k \geq 3$ for which $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ is irreducible (over some extension G of L and for some G -module of dimension d_1 in some characteristic ℓ), and the fifth column we list the values (k_2, d_2) such that k_2 is the (known) highest possible $k \geq 3$ for which $\wedge^k(V)$ is irreducible (over some extension G of L and for some G -module of dimension d_2 in some characteristic ℓ). The cases marked by $(\diamond)$ are the ones where we only look at $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ and $\wedge^k(V)$ with $k \geq 4$. The cases marked by $(\heartsuit)$ are the ones where we only look at $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ with $k \geq 4$ and $\wedge^k(V)$ with $k \geq 5$. The cases marked by $(\spadesuit)$ are the ones where we only look at $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ with $k \geq 4$ and $\wedge^k(V)$ with $k \geq 6$.

1) For the first 11 sporadic groups, the ℓ -modular decomposition matrix is completely known, cf. [JLPW]. In these cases, it is straightforward to verify the above statements. Assume $S = M_{11}$. Then $\mathbf{m}(G) = 55$ and $d \geq 10$, and so (5) cannot hold. Assume $S = M_{12}$. Then $\mathbf{m}(G) = 320$ and so (5) implies $d \leq 13$. Using [Atlas] and [JLPW], we can check that $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ and $\wedge^k(V)$ are reducible for $k \geq 4$, $\text{Sym}^3(V)$ is reducible except when $d = 10$, and $\wedge^3(V)$ is reducible except when $d = 10, 12$. The cases $S = J_1, M_{23}$ are similar.

TABLE I. Groups G with $S := \text{soc}(G/Z(G))$ being a sporadic finite simple group.

S	Sym^k reducible when	Irreducible Sym^k	$\wedge^k$ reducible when	Irreducible $\wedge^k$
M_{11}	$k \geq 3$		$3 \leq k \leq d-3$	
M_{12}	$k \geq 4$	$k = 3, d = 10$	$4 \leq k \leq d-4$	$k = 3, d = 10, 12$
J_1	$k \geq 3$		$3 \leq k \leq d-3$	
M_{22}	$k \geq 3$		$6 \leq k \leq d-6$	$k = 5, d = 10$
J_2	$k \geq 6$	$k = 5, d = 6$	$3 \leq k \leq d-3$	
M_{23}	$k \geq 3$		$3 \leq k \leq d-3$	
HS	$k \geq 3$		$4 \leq k \leq d-4$	$k = 3, d = 22$
J_3	$k \geq 4$	$k = 3, d = 18$	$4 \leq k \leq d-4$	$k = 3, d = 18$
M_{24}	$k \geq 3$		$4 \leq k \leq d-4$	$k = 3, d = 23$
McL	$k \geq 3$		$4 \leq k \leq d-4$	$k = 3, d = 22$
He	$k \geq 3$		$3 \leq k \leq d-3$	
$Ru^{(\diamond)}$	$k \geq 4$		$6 \leq k \leq d-6$	$k = 5, d = 28$
$Suz^{(\diamond)}$	$k \geq 6$	$k = 5, d = 12$	$4 \leq k \leq d-4$	$k = 3, d = 12$
$O'N^{(\diamond)}$	$k \geq 4$		$4 \leq k \leq d-4$	
$Co_3^{(\diamond)}$	$k \geq 4$		$4 \leq k \leq d-4$	$k = 3, d = 23$
$Co_2^{(\diamond)}$	$k \geq 4$		$4 \leq k \leq d-4$	$k = 3, d = 23$
$Fi_{22}^{(\diamond)}$	$k \geq 4$		$4 \leq k \leq d-4$	
$HN^{(\diamond)}$	$k \geq 4$		$4 \leq k \leq d-4$	
$Fi_{23}^{(\diamond)}$	$k \geq 4$		$4 \leq k \leq d-4$	
$J_4^{(\diamond)}$	$k \geq 4$		$4 \leq k \leq d-4$	$k = 3, d = 1333$
$Ly^{(\heartsuit)}$	$k \geq 4$		$5 \leq k \leq d-5$	
$Th^{(\heartsuit)}$	$k \geq 4$		$5 \leq k \leq d-5$	
$Co_1^{(\heartsuit)}$	$k \geq 4$		$5 \leq k \leq d-5$	$k = 3, d = 24$
$Fi'_{24}^{(\heartsuit)}$	$k \geq 4$		$5 \leq k \leq d-5$	
$B^{(\spadesuit)}$	$k \geq 4$		$6 \leq k \leq d-6$	
$M^{(\spadesuit)}$	$k \geq 4, \ell \neq 5, 7$ $k \geq 5, \ell = 5$ $k \geq 6, \ell = 7$		$6 \leq k \leq d-6$	

Assume $S = M_{22}$. Then $\mathfrak{m}(G) = 1120$ and so $d \leq 19$. It follows that either $d = 10$, in which case $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ is reducible for $k \geq 3$, $\wedge^k(V)$ is reducible for $k \geq 6$ but irreducible (over $L \cdot 2$) when $\ell = 0$ and $k \leq 5$, or $(d, \ell) = (16, 7)$, in which case $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ is reducible for $k \geq 3$, $\wedge^k(V)$ is reducible for $k \geq 4$, but irreducible for $k = 3$. The cases $S = J_2, HS, J_3, M_{24}, McL, He$ are similar.

2) For the remaining 15 sporadic simple groups which are not included in [JLPW], we will work with the stronger bound

$$(6) \quad \dim(\wedge^4(V)) < \mathfrak{m}(G) .$$

The lower bound for d is listed in [Jan]. In some cases, the modules V satisfying (5) are determined using [HM]. We also use the decomposition matrices available online at [ModAt]. Assume $S = Ru$. Then $\mathfrak{m}(G) = 250,560$ and so (6) implies $d \leq 52$, whence $d = 28$ by [HM]. It follows that V lifts to a complex module $V_{\mathbb{C}}$. Using [Atlas] and [JLPW], we can check that $\text{Sym}^k(V_{\mathbb{C}})$ is reducible for $k \geq 4$, $\wedge^k(V_{\mathbb{C}})$ is reducible for $k \geq 6$ and irreducible for $k \leq 5$. The cases $S = Suz, O'N, CO_3, Co_2, Fi_{22}, HN, Fi_{23}, J_4$ are similar.

3) For the 6 largest sporadic simple groups, there is only very scarce information about the irreducible ℓ -modular Brauer characters of them and their covers. Even in the case the Sylow ℓ -subgroups of L are cyclic, the shape of the Brauer tree is not known in some cases, cf. [HL].

Assume $S = Ly$. Then (6) implies $d \leq 203$. Hence $d = 111$ and V is of type + by [HM], and so $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ is reducible for $k \geq 2$ and $\wedge^k(V)$ is reducible for $k \geq 5$.

Assume $S = Th$. Then $d \geq 248$, whence $\dim(\wedge^5(V)) > \mathfrak{m}(G)$ and so $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ and $\wedge^k(V)$ are reducible for $k \geq 5$. Claim that $\text{Sym}^4(V)$ is reducible as well. Assume the contrary. Consider subgroups $H = {}^3D_4(2)$ and $K = H \cdot 3$ of G . Then all irreducible ℓ -modular Brauer characters of H are of type +. The proof of Lemma 2.15(i) implies that $\text{Sym}^4(V)|_H$ contains 1_H , whence $\text{Sym}^4(V)|_K$ contains a 1-dimensional submodule by Lemma 2.12(i). By Frobenius' reciprocity, $\dim(\text{Sym}^4(V)) \leq (G : Z(G)K)$ and so $d \leq 242$, a contradiction.

Assume $S = Co_1$. Then (6) implies $d \leq 398$. In fact if $d \geq 170$ then $\dim(\wedge^5(V)) > \mathfrak{m}(G)$ and so $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ and $\wedge^k(V)$ are reducible for $k \geq 5$. If $d < 170$ then $d = 24$ and V lifts to a complex module $V_{\mathbb{C}}$, cf. [HM], with reducible $\wedge^5(V_{\mathbb{C}})$ and $\text{Sym}^2(V_{\mathbb{C}})$. Claim that $\text{Sym}^4(V)$ is reducible if $170 \leq d \leq 398$. Assume the contrary. Consider the subgroup $H = Co_2$ of G . Using [ModAt], one can check that all irreducible ℓ -modular Brauer characters of H of degree ≤ 398 are of type +. Now Lemma 2.15(i) implies that $d \leq 39$, a contradiction.

Assume $S = Fi'_{24}$. Then $d \geq 781$, whence $\dim(\wedge^5(V)) > \mathfrak{m}(G)$ and so $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ and $\wedge^k(V)$ are reducible for $k \geq 5$. In fact if $d \geq 2726$ then $\dim(\text{Sym}^4(V)) > \mathfrak{m}(G)$ and so $\text{Sym}^4(V)$ is reducible. Claim that $\text{Sym}^4(V)$ is also reducible if $2 \leq d \leq 2725$. Assume the contrary. Consider the subgroup $H = Fi_{23}$ of G . Using [ModAt], one can check that all irreducible ℓ -modular Brauer characters of H of degree ≤ 2725 are of type + if $\ell \neq 17$. In the case $\ell = 17$, H has exactly 17 complex irreducible characters of positive 17-defect and they all belong to the principal 17-block. The shape of the Brauer tree of this block is determined in [HL]. Using this information we can show that the irreducible Brauer characters in the block are either trivial, or equal to $\hat{\chi} - 1_H$, or of degree ≥ 3588 , where χ is the unique character of degree 783

in $\text{Irr}(H)$ and $\hat{\chi}$ denotes the restriction of χ to ℓ' -elements. Now it is easy to verify our claim for $\ell = 17$. Hence Lemma 2.15(i) implies that $d < 83$, a contradiction.

4) Assume $S = B$. Then $d \geq 4370$, whence $\dim(\wedge^6(V)) > \mathfrak{m}(G)$ and so $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ and $\wedge^k(V)$ are reducible for $k \geq 6$. In fact if $d \geq 29,130$ then $\dim(\text{Sym}^4(V)) > \mathfrak{m}(G)$ and so $\text{Sym}^4(V)$ is reducible. Claim that $\text{Sym}^4(V)$ and $\text{Sym}^5(V)$ are also reducible if $2 \leq d \leq 29,129$ (in particular $L = S$) and $\ell \neq 5, 7$. Assume the contrary. Consider the subgroup $H = C_G(t) \simeq 2 \cdot {}^2E_6(2)$ for some involution $t \in G$. Then $V_0 := \text{Ker}(t-1)$ is actually a nonzero ${}^2E_6(2)$ -module. Using [Atlas] and [ModAt], one can check that all irreducible ℓ -modular Brauer characters of ${}^2E_6(2)$ of degree $\leq 29,129$ are of type $+$ if $\ell \geq 11$. This is also true for $\ell = 7$, cf. [Mu1] and for $\ell = 5$, cf. [Mu2]. Now any simple H -submodule U of V_0 is of type $+$. Hence Lemma 2.15(i) and its proof imply that $d < 1600$, a contradiction.

5) From now on we assume $S = M$. Since $\text{Mult}(M) = 1$, $L = S$, $G = Z(G) \times S$. Without loss we may assume $G = M$. Now $d \geq 196,882$ and $\mathfrak{m}(G) < (2.6) \cdot 10^{26}$, whence $\dim(\wedge^6(V)) > \mathfrak{m}(G)$ and so $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ and $\wedge^k(V)$ are reducible for $k \geq 6$. In fact if $d \geq D := (8.9) \cdot 10^6$ then $\dim(\text{Sym}^4(V)) > \mathfrak{m}(G)$ and so $\text{Sym}^4(V)$ is reducible. We will show that if $2 \leq d < D$ and $\ell \neq 5, 7$ then $\text{Sym}^k(V)$ is also reducible for $k = 4, 5$. Assume the contrary. According to [Atlas] and [ModAt], any such a V is of type $+$ if $\ell = 0, 17, 19, 23$, or 31 . So $\ell \in \{11, 13, 29, 41, 47, 59, 71\}$.

Consider the subgroup $H = 2 \cdot B = C_G(t)$, where t is an involution of class $2A$ of G . Since $\ell \neq 2$, we have $V = V_0 \oplus V_1$, where $V_j = \text{Ker}(t - (-1)^j) \neq 0$. According to [Jan], $\dim(V_1) \geq 96256$. Claim that any Brauer character ψ of degree $< D$, in $\text{IBr}_\ell(H)$ if $\ell \neq 47$ and in $\text{IBr}_\ell(B)$ if $\ell = 47$, is of type $+$. Using [Atlas] and [ModAt], one readily checks the claim for $\ell \in \{11, 29, 41, 59, 71\}$. Also, one needs to consider only characters ψ belonging to ℓ -blocks of positive defect. Notice that $\text{Irr}(H)$ have a unique character of degree 1, resp. 4371, 96, 255, 1, 139, 374, 96, 256, all of type $+$, and we denote them by χ_1 , resp. $\chi_2, \chi_3, \chi_4, \chi_5$. Assume $\ell = 13$. Then H has 7 blocks of positive defect (all with cyclic defect group), and the shapes of their Brauer trees have been determined in [HL]. Now we can find the degrees of Brauer characters in these blocks. It follows that such a ψ is $\hat{\chi}_i$ with $1 \leq i \leq 5$, and so the claim follows. Assume $\ell = 47$. Then the only block of positive defect of B is the principal block (and it has cyclic defect group). There are five possible shapes for the Brauer tree of this block, as shown in [HL]. Now we can find the degrees of Brauer characters in all of these five cases. It follows that such a ψ is either $\hat{\chi}_i$ with $i = 1, 3, 4$ or $\hat{\chi}_2 - 1_B$, and so the claim follows again.

6) First we handle the case $\ell \neq 47$. The above claim implies that, for $j = 0, 1$, $V_j|_H$ contains a simple submodule U_j of type $+$. Now if $k = 4$, then

$$\text{Sym}^4(V)|_H \supset \text{Sym}^4(U_0) \oplus \text{Sym}^4(U_1) \supset 2 \cdot 1_H.$$

Thus

$$2 \leq \dim \text{Hom}_H(1_H, \text{Sym}^4(V)|_H) = \dim \text{Hom}_G(\text{Ind}_H^G(1_H), \text{Sym}^4(V))$$

and so $\dim(\text{Sym}^4(V)) \leq (G : H)/2$ by Frobenius' reciprocity. It follows that $d \leq 186, 120$, a contradiction. Assume $k = 5$. Then

$$\text{Sym}^5(V)|_H \supset \text{Sym}^5(U_0) \oplus \text{Sym}^5(U_1) \supset U_0 \oplus U_1.$$

Among U_0 and U_1 we choose U_j of smaller dimension. Then Frobenius' reciprocity implies $\dim(\text{Sym}^5(V)) \leq (G : H)d/2$, whence $d \leq 278, 315$ and $\dim(V_0) \leq d - 96, 256 = 182, 059$. Thus all composition factors of $V_0|_H$ have dimension 1, 4371, or 96, 255, and all composition factors of $V_1|_H$ have dimension 96, 256. Claim that $V_0|_H$ has a simple submodule or a simple quotient, call it U , of dimension ≤ 4371 . (If not, all simple submodules and simple quotients of it have dimension 96, 255. But $\dim(V_0) < 2 \cdot 96, 255$, so in fact $\dim(V_0) = 96, 255$. Now we have

$$100, 627 = 196, 882 - 96, 255 \leq \dim(V_1) \leq 182, 060 = 278, 315 - 96, 255,$$

which is impossible as all composition factors of $V_1|_H$ have dimension 96, 256.) Since V_0 is a direct summand of $V|_H$, Frobenius' reciprocity implies $\dim(\text{Sym}^5(V)) \leq \dim(U) \cdot (G : H) \leq 4371 \cdot (G : H)$, and so $d \leq 139, 300$, again a contradiction.

7) Finally we treat the case $\ell = 47$. The claim proved in 5) implies that $V_0|_H$ contains a simple submodule U_0 of type $+$. Let φ , resp. α, β , denote the Brauer character afforded by V , resp. $V_0|_H, V_1|_H$. According to [Atlas], G has another involution t' such that t, t', tt' are all in the class $2A$ of G and t' belongs to class $2A$ in H ; in fact $C_G(\langle t, t' \rangle) = 2^2 \cdot {}^2E_6(2)$. Observe that $\beta(t') = 0$. Indeed, $t|_{V_0} = 1_{V_0}$ and $t|_{V_1} = -1_{V_1}$, whence $\alpha(tt') = \alpha(t')$ and $\beta(tt') = -\beta(t')$. Now

$$\alpha(t') + \beta(t') = \varphi(t') = \varphi(tt') = \alpha(tt') + \beta(tt') = \alpha(t') - \beta(t'),$$

and so $\beta(t') = 0$.

By Lemma 2.15(i) we get $d \leq 221, 336$ if $k = 4$ and $d \leq 330, 975$ if $k = 5$. It follows that all irreducible constituents of α have degree 1, 4371, or 96, 254, and we label them as ψ_1, ψ_3 , and ψ_2 , respectively. As in 6), we see that $V_0|_H$ cannot have a simple submodule or a simple quotient of dimension ≤ 4371 if $k = 5$, and it cannot have two distinct simple submodules if $k = 4$. Observe that ψ_1 and ψ_2 belong to the principal block and ψ_3 has defect 0. Claim that all composition factors of $V_0|_H$ belong to the principal block. Assume the contrary. Then $k \neq 5$ as we noted. Now if these composition factors involve two different blocks then $V_0|_H$ has simple submodules U_0 and U_1 (from different blocks), a contradiction. So all composition factors of $V_0|_H$ have Brauer character ψ_3 (of degree 4371) and are isomorphic to U_0 . Since ψ_3 has defect 0, $\text{Ext}_H^1(U_0, U_0) = 0$. Thus $V_0|_H$ is in fact a direct sum of say a copies of U_0 . As we noted, a cannot be greater than 1, so $\alpha = \psi_3$, in particular, $\alpha(t') = -493$. Now

$$4371 - \dim(V_1) = \varphi(t) = \varphi(t') = \alpha(t') + \beta(t') = -493 + 0,$$

whence $\dim(V_1) = 4864$ and $d = 9235$, a contradiction.

Thus we may write $\alpha = x\psi_1 + y\psi_2$ for some non-negative integers x, y . Then

$$x + y \cdot 96,254 - \dim(V_1) = \varphi(t) = \varphi(t') = \alpha(t') + \beta(t') = x + y \cdot 4862 + 0,$$

and so $\dim(V_1) = y \cdot 91,392$. Since $\dim(V_1) \geq 96,256$, $y \geq 2$. It follows that $d \geq 2 \cdot 96,255 + 96,256 = 288,766$ and so $k = 5$ (as $d \leq 221,336$ if $k = 4$). Clearly, $\dim(U_0) \leq 96,254$ and $\text{Sym}^5(V)|_H \supset \text{Sym}^5(U_0) \supset U_0$. By Frobenius' reciprocity, $\dim(\text{Sym}^5(V)) \leq (G : H) \cdot 96,254$, whence $d \leq 258,535$, contradicting the bound $d \geq 288,766$.

To complete the proof, we notice that $\text{Sym}^5(V)$ is reducible when $\ell = 5$ by Lemma 2.1. $\square$

8. PROOFS OF MAIN RESULTS

Proof of Theorem 1.1. It follows immediately from Proposition 2.14 and Theorems 3.1, 4.1, 5.1, and 7.1. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Since there is nothing to prove in the case $d = 1$, we may assume that $d \geq 2$. Now we can apply Proposition 2.14 to G .

First we consider the case $G_{\mathbf{n}}^{\circ} \neq 1$. If $d = 2$ then $\mathcal{G}$ and $G_{\mathbf{n}}^{\circ}$ are both of type A_1 whence $G_{\mathbf{n}}^{\circ} = SL(V)$. If $d \geq 3$, then $\ell > k$ by Lemma 2.1 and we can apply Theorem 3.1 to $G_{\mathbf{n}}^{\circ}$.

Next we consider the case where the conclusion (iii) of Proposition 2.8 holds. As in the proof of Theorem 5.1 we may assume $\ell = 0$ and $k = 4$; in particular $\dim(\text{Sym}^4(V))$ divides $|G|$. Now if $d = 2$ then P is a 2-group and $G/P \leq Sp_2(2)$ is a $\{2, 3\}$ -group, but $\dim(\text{Sym}^4(V)) = 5$. If $d = 3$ then P is a 3-group and $G/P \leq Sp_2(3)$ is a $\{2, 3\}$ -group, but $\dim(\text{Sym}^4(V)) = 15$. If $d = 4$ then P is a 2-group and $G/P \leq Sp_4(2)$ is a $\{2, 3, 5\}$ -group, but $\dim(\text{Sym}^4(V)) = 35$. Thus all these possibilities cannot occur here.

So we may assume that the conclusion (ii) of Proposition 2.8 holds. Consider $L := G^{(\infty)}$ and $S := L/Z(L)$. First suppose that $\ell > 0$ and $S \in \text{Lie}(\ell)$. If $d = 2$ then $L = SL_2(q)$ by [KL, Prop. 5.4.13]. If $d \geq 3$, then $\ell > k$ and again we can apply Theorem 3.1 to $G_{\mathbf{n}}$. Now we may assume that $S \notin \text{Lie}(\ell)$ if $\ell > 0$. Existing lower bounds on the dimension of (projective) irreducible representations of S , cf. [KL] and [LS], and the condition $d \leq 4$ imply that $S \in \{A_5, A_6, A_7, PSL_2(7), PSL_3(4), PSU_4(2)\}$. We will analyze these possibilities case by case and apply the obvious upper bound $\dim(\text{Sym}^4(V)) \leq \mathfrak{m}(G)$.

Assume $S = A_5$. Since $\mathfrak{m}(G) = 6$, $d = 2$, and we arrive at (iii) by inspecting [Atlas] and [JLPW]. Assume $S = A_6$. Since $S \notin \text{Lie}(\ell)$, $\ell \neq 2, 3$. It follows that $d = 3, 4$ and V lifts to a complex module $V_{\mathbb{C}}$. Now it is easy to check that $\text{Sym}^4(V_{\mathbb{C}})$ is reducible and so is $\text{Sym}^k(V)$. A similar argument applies to the cases $S = PSL_2(7)$, $PSU_4(2)$. Assume $S = PSL_3(4)$. Since $S \notin \text{Lie}(\ell)$, $\ell \neq 2$, whence $d \geq 3$ by [JLPW]. This in turn implies by Lemma 2.1 that $\ell > k \geq 4$ and so $d \geq 6$ by [JLPW]. Finally, assume

$S = A_7$. Again, $d \geq 3$ by [JLPW] and so $\ell \geq 5$ by Lemma 2.1. If $d = 4$ then V lifts to a complex module $V_{\mathbb{C}}$ and $\text{Sym}^4(V_{\mathbb{C}})$ is reducible. So $d = 3$, $\ell = 5$ and we arrive at (iv). $\square$

Proof of Corollary 1.6. Clearly we need to consider only the case where $\ell > 0$ and $d \geq 3$. Now the statement is a consequence of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 (and a direct computation for the small groups listed in Theorem 1.1(iii) and Theorem 1.2(iv)). $\square$

9. LARSEN'S CONJECTURE

Let $\mathbb{F}$ be an algebraically closed field of characteristic 0, $V = \mathbb{F}^d$ with $d > 4$, and let $\mathcal{G} = GL(V)$, $GO(V)$, or $Sp(V)$. Label the fundamental weights of $\mathcal{G}$ such that $V = L(\varpi_1)$, the irreducible $\mathcal{G}$ -module with highest weight ϖ_1 , and $L(\varpi_k)$ is a subquotient of the $\mathcal{G}$ -module $\wedge^k(V)$ if $d \geq 2k$. Then $L(k\varpi_1)$ is a subquotient of the $\mathcal{G}$ -module $\text{Sym}^k(V)$.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Let G be as in the theorem, $\mathcal{G} = GO(V)$, and assume that G is irreducible on $L(4\varpi_1) = \text{Sym}^4(V)/\mathcal{S}(V)$. By Corollary 2.19(ii), G is irreducible on $L(2\varpi_1) = \text{Sym}^2(V)/1_G$. By [T2, Cor. 1.7], one of the following holds for $S := \text{soc}(G/Z(G))$ and $L := G^{(\infty)}$.

- a) $d = 7$ and $G = G_2(\mathbb{F})$. Here G is reducible on $\wedge^2(V)$.
- b) $d = 2^a \geq 8$ and $G \leq N_{\mathcal{G}}(E)$ for $E = 2_+^{1+2a}$. By Theorem 5.1, G is reducible on $\wedge^4(V)$.
- c) $d = (5^n + 1)/2 \geq 13$, $S = PSp_{2n}(5)$, and $V|_S$ is a Weil representation. We restrict V to the subgroup $C := C_S(t)$, where t is a long-root element, and apply Lemma 2.15(ii). It follows that G is reducible on $\wedge^4(V)$.
- d) $d = (3^{2n+1} + 1)/4 \geq 7$, $S = SU_{2n+1}(3)$, and $V|_S$ affords the Weil character $\zeta_{2n+1,3}^2$, cf. [TZ2]. Then for the subgroup $H = SU_{2n}(3)$, $V|_H$ affords the character $\zeta_{2n,3}^0 + \zeta_{2n,3}^1 + \bar{\zeta}_{2n,3}^1$. When $n \geq 2$ we can apply Lemma 2.15(ii) to see that G is reducible on $\wedge^4(V)$. When $n = 1$, clearly G is reducible on $L(4\varpi_1)$ (of dimension 182).
- e) $d = (2^{2n} + 2)/3 \geq 6$, $S = SU_{2n}(2)$, and $V|_S$ affords the Weil character $\zeta_{2n,2}^0$, cf. [TZ2]. Then for the subgroup $H = SU_{2n-1}(2)$, $V|_H$ affords the character $\zeta_{2n-1,2}^1 + \bar{\zeta}_{2n-1,2}^1$. When $n \geq 4$ we can apply Lemma 2.15(ii) to see that G is reducible on $\wedge^4(V)$. When $n = 2$, clearly G is reducible on $L(4\varpi_1)$ (of dimension 105).
- f) $(d, L) = (7, SL_2(8))$, $(18, Sp_4(4))$, $(7, Sp_6(2))$, $(8, \hat{A}_8)$, $(8, \hat{A}_9)$, $(8, 2 \cdot Sp_6(2))$, $(8, \Omega_8^+(2))$, $(14, G_2(3))$, $(22, McL)$, $(23, Co_3)$, $(23, Co_2)$, $(24, 2 \cdot Co_1)$, $(52, 2 \cdot F_4(2))$, $(78, Fi_{22})$, $(133, HN)$, $(248, Th)$. In all cases but $(24, 2 \cdot Co_1)$, G is reducible on $L(4\varpi_1)$. In the case of $(24, 2 \cdot Co_1)$, G is reducible on $\wedge^4(V)$ (but observe that G is irreducible on $L(k\varpi_1)$ for $k \leq 5$!) $\square$

Proof of Corollary 1.5. Notice that the reductivity of G° implies that the G -module $V^{\otimes 4}$ is semisimple. Also, $L(4\varpi_1)$ and $L(\varpi_4)$ are composition factors of the

$\mathcal{G}$ -module $V^{\otimes 4}$, and $L(\varpi_2)$ is a composition factors of the $\mathcal{G}$ -module $V^{\otimes 2}$. Hence the statement follows from Theorem 1.4 in the case $\mathcal{G} = GO(V)$ (notice that here $d > 4$ by the assumptions). Assume that $\mathcal{G} = GL(V)$ or $Sp(V)$. Then $L(4\varpi_1) = \text{Sym}^4(V)$, and we can apply Theorems 1.1 and 1.2. First suppose that $\mathcal{G} = GL(V)$. Then notice that $Sp(V)$ is reducible on the $\mathcal{G}$ -submodule $L(\varpi_4) = \wedge^4(V)$ if $d \geq 8$ and on $L(\varpi_2) = \wedge^2(V)$ if $d = 4, 6$; furthermore, G is reducible on $\wedge^4(V)$ in the cases $(d, L) = (12, 2G_2(4))$, $(12, 6Suz)$. So we arrive at (ii). Assume $\mathcal{G} = Sp(V)$. Then G is reducible on $L(\varpi_4)$ (of dimension 429) in the case $(d, L) = (12, 2G_2(4))$, so we again arrive at (ii). $\square$

REFERENCES

- [A] M. Aschbacher, On the maximal subgroups of the finite classical groups, *Invent. Math.* **76** (1984), 469 – 514.
- [BK] V. Balaji and J. Kollár, Holonomy groups and stable vector bundles, *Publ. Math. RIMS* (to appear), (preprint: arXiv:math.AG/0601120).
- [Atlas] J. H. Conway, R. T. Curtis, S. P. Norton, R. A. Parker, and R. A. Wilson, ‘*An ATLAS of Finite Groups*’, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1985.
- [DM] F. Digne and J. Michel, ‘*Representations of Finite Groups of Lie Type*’, London Mathematical Society Student Texts 21, Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- [DW] M. P. Do Carmo and N. R. Wallach, Minimal immersions of spheres into spheres, *Annals of Math.* **93** (1971), 43 – 62.
- [Dyn] E. B. Dynkin, Maximal subgroups of the classical groups, *Amer. Math. Soc. Translations*, **6** (1957), 245 – 378.
- [FH] W. Fulton and J. Harris, ‘*Representation Theory*’, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1991.
- [Fo] B. Ford, Overgroups of irreducible linear groups. I, *J. Algebra* **181** (1996), 26 – 69; II, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **351** (1999), 3869 – 3913.
- [Ge] M. Geck, Irreducible Brauer characters of the 3-dimensional special unitary groups in non-describing characteristic, *Comm. Algebra* **18** (1990), 563 – 584.
- [GMST] R. M. Guralnick, K. Magaard, J. Saxl, and Pham Huu Tiep, Cross characteristic representations of symplectic groups and unitary groups, *J. Algebra* **257** (2002), 291 – 347.
- [GS] R. M. Guralnick and J. Saxl, Generation of finite almost simple groups by conjugates, *J. Algebra* **268** (2003), 519 – 571.
- [GT1] R. M. Guralnick and Pham Huu Tiep, Cross characteristic representations of even characteristic symplectic groups, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **356** (2004), 4969 – 5023.
- [GT2] R. M. Guralnick and Pham Huu Tiep, Decompositions of small tensor powers and Larsen’s conjecture, *Represent. Theory* **9** (2005), 138 – 208.
- [GT3] R. M. Guralnick and Pham Huu Tiep, The non-coprime $k(GV)$ problem, *J. Algebra* **293** (2005), 185 – 242.
- [HL] G. Hiss and K. Lux, ‘*Brauer Trees of Sporadic Groups*’, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1989.
- [HM] G. Hiss and G. Malle, Corrigenda: Low-dimensional representations of quasi-simple groups, *LMS J. Comput. Math.* **5** (2002), 95 – 126.
- [Hof] C. Hoffman, Projective representations for some exceptional finite groups of Lie type, in: ‘*Modular Representation Theory of Finite Groups*’, M. J. Collins, B. J. Parshall, L. L. Scott, eds., Walter de Gruyter, Berlin et al, 2001, 223 – 230.
- [HH] P. N. Hoffman and J. F. Humphreys, ‘*Projective Representations of the Symmetric Group*’, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1992.

- [Jan] C. Jansen, The minimal degrees of faithful representations of the sporadic simple groups and their covering groups, *LMS J. Comput. Math.* **8** (2005), 122 – 144.
- [JLPW] C. Jansen, K. Lux, R. A. Parker, and R. A. Wilson, ‘*An ATLAS of Brauer Characters*’, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1995.
- [Ka1] N. Katz, Larsen’s alternative, moments, and the monodromy of Lefschetz pencils, in: ‘*Contributions to Automorphic Forms, Geometry, and Number Theory*’, Johns Hopkins University Press, pp. 521 – 560.
- [Ka2] N. Katz, ‘*Moments, Monodromy, and Perversity: a Diophantine Perspective*’, Annals of Math. Study, **159** Princeton Univ. Press, (2005).
- [KIL] P. B. Kleidman and M. W. Liebeck, ‘*The Subgroup Structure of the Finite Classical Groups*’, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser. no. 129, Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- [KT] A. S. Kleshchev and Pham Huu Tiep, On restrictions of modular spin representations of symmetric and alternating groups, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **356** (2004), 1971 – 1999.
- [KL] J. Kollár and M. Larsen, Symmetric powers, in: ‘*Algebra, Arithmetic and Geometry - a Tribute to Yuri Manin*’, *Progress in Mathematics* vols. **269**, **270**, Birkhäuser.
- [LS] V. Landazuri and G. Seitz, On the minimal degrees of projective representations of the finite Chevalley groups, *J. Algebra* **32** (1974), 418 – 443.
- [Lu] F. Lübeck, Smallest degrees of representations of exceptional groups of Lie type, *Comm. Algebra* **29** (2001), 2147 – 2169.
- [MMT] K. Magaard, G. Malle and Pham Huu Tiep, Irreducibility of tensor squares, symmetric squares, and alternating squares, *Pacific J. Math.* **202** (2002), 379 – 427.
- [MT1] K. Magaard and Pham Huu Tiep, Irreducible tensor products of representations of finite quasi-simple groups of Lie type, in: ‘*Modular Representation Theory of Finite Groups*’, M. J. Collins, B. J. Parshall, L. L. Scott, eds., Walter de Gruyter, Berlin et al, 2001, pp. 239 – 262.
- [MT2] K. Magaard and Pham Huu Tiep, Quasisimple subgroups of classes $\mathcal{C}_6$ and $\mathcal{C}_7$ of finite classical groups, (in preparation).
- [McN] G. McNinch, Semisimplicity of exterior powers of semisimple representations of groups, *J. Algebra* **225** (2000), 646 – 666.
- [ModAt] Decomposition matrices, available online at <http://www.math.rwth-aachen.de/homes/MOC/decomposition/>
- [Mu1] J. Müller, ‘*Zerlegungszahlen für generische Iwahori-Hecke-Algebren von exzeptionellem Typ*’, Dissertation, RWTH Aachen, 1995.
- [Mu2] J. Müller, (private communication).
- [NT] G. Navarro and Pham Huu Tiep, Rational irreducible characters and rational conjugacy classes in finite groups, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **360** (2008), 2443 – 2465.
- [Noz] S. Nozawa, Characters of the finite general unitary group $U(5, q^2)$, *J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect. IA* **23** (1976), 23 – 74.
- [Ra1] C. S. Rajan, Unique decomposition of tensor products of irreducible representations of simple algebraic groups, *Ann. of Math.* **160** (2004), 683 – 704.
- [Ra2] C. S. Rajan, Recovering modular forms and representations from tensor and symmetric powers, in: ‘*Algebra and Number Theory*’, Hindustan Book Agency, Delhi, (2005), pp. 281 – 298.
- [Se1] G. M. Seitz, ‘*The Maximal Subgroups of Classical Algebraic Groups*, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **67** (1987), no. 365.
- [Se2] G. M. Seitz, Cross-characteristic embeddings of finite groups of Lie type, *Proc. London Math. Soc.* **60** (1990), 166 – 200.

- [S] J.-P. Serre, Sur la semi-simplicité des produits tensoriels de représentations de groupes, *Invent. Math.* **116** (1994), 513 – 530.
- [ST] P. Sin and Pham Huu Tiep, Rank 3 permutation modules for finite classical groups, *J. Algebra* **291** (2005), 551 – 606.
- [Su] I. Suprunenko, Conditions on the irreducibility of restrictions of irreducible representations of the group $SL(n, K)$ to connected algebraic subgroups, Preprint #13, (222), Inst. Mat. Akad. Nauk BSSR, 1985 (in Russian).
- [Tes] D. Testerman, Irreducible subgroups of exceptional algebraic groups, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* **75** (1988), no. 390.
- [Th] J. G. Thompson, Bilinear forms in characteristic p and the Frobenius-Schur indicator, in: *Lecture Notes Math.* **1185** (1986), pp. 221 – 230.
- [T1] Pham Huu Tiep, Basic spin representations of $2S_n$ and $2A_n$ as globally irreducible representations, *Archiv Math.* **64** (1995), 103 – 112.
- [T2] Pham Huu Tiep, Finite groups admitting grassmannian 4-designs, *J. Algebra* **306** (2006), 227 – 243.
- [TZ1] Pham Huu Tiep and A. E. Zalesskii, Minimal characters of the finite classical groups, *Comm. Algebra* **24** (1996), 2093 – 2167.
- [TZ2] Pham Huu Tiep and A. E. Zalesskii, Some characterizations of the Weil representations of the symplectic and unitary groups, *J. Algebra* **192** (1997), 130 – 165.
- [Wa] D. B. Wales, Some projective representations of S_n , *J. Algebra* **61** (1979), 37 – 57.
- [Zs] K. Zsigmondy, Zur Theorie der Potenzreste, *Monath. Math. Phys.* **3** (1892), 265 – 284.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES, CA 90089-1113, USA

E-mail address: guralnic@math.usc.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA, GAINESVILLE, FL 32611, USA

Since Aug. 2008: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA, TUCSON, AZ 85721, USA

E-mail address: tiep@math.arizona.edu